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Reviews

John A. Jakle and Keith A. Sculle’s illuminating study of signs in American culture grapples with an impressively broad range of factors and disciplinary methods. From social psychology, civil engineering, cultural geography, business history, and semiotics, to name a few, Jakle and Sculle draw important tools for their investigation of signs both as aesthetic objects and as signifiers of particular value systems in U.S. history. They begin with a concise and helpful discussion of the four interrelated dimensions of signs, namely, their capacities to “(1) identify, (2) persuade, (3) orient, and (4) regulate” (xxxi). This semiotic foundation stands the reader in good stead as the authors proceed through a more historical discussion, in Part One, of the rise of outdoor commercial billboards, electrification, the architectural integration of buildings and signs, and innovation and standardization within the sign industry over the course of the twentieth century. Jakle and Sculle do a fine analysis of the transformation of the American “main street” as a landscape marked by “faith in the future, especially a future linked to automobility” (31). Indeed, it is the automobile, as the title makes clear, that enabled the consumerist revolution of the early twentieth century, and the abundance of signed space that as its consequence. The authors point out repeatedly the tremendous impact made by the automobile and the highway culturally, aesthetically, and socially, and the importance of ever-shifting roadside signs to understanding and interpreting the values and protocols of consumer culture. “Signs,” they write, “are material culture, but they are the most abstract aspects of the roadside in acting on travelers. They distill reality into an idea whose fulfillment is deferred” (49). Part Two confronts “Signing Public Places,” and the effect of signs—both traffic signs and symbols such as the flag—upon flows of people and commerce, structures of community and nation, and affective ties between individuals. Part Four examines the ways in ways individuals use signs, broadly construed, to affirm and resist gender and class identities, mark territory, and express themselves. Here, in a too-brief discussion of signage drawn on or affixed to the
individual body, Jakle and Sculle miss an opportunity, especially given their focus on consumerism, to inquire into individuals' willing self-commodification for commercial entities such as say, Nike or Old Navy. Part Five concludes the study with an evaluation of the aesthetic and navigational effects of ever-more-ubiquitous signage. Jakle and Sculle ask here, “What, in the American experience, has been most widely asserted about signs and their visual impact on place?” (118). Looking at antisign activism and regulation by both the industry and the state, the authors discuss the ways in which signs both add to and blight landscapes of the roadside and residential spaces. The book’s conclusion asks that historians and social scientists pay more attention to “the posting and reading of signs,” which the authors assert is, “at base a form of social negotiation” (168). Jakle and Sculle have provided a far-reaching, though by no means exhaustive study of this neglected material culture; other scholars investigating more specific signs and signed spaces will, no doubt, find this study a valuable tool.

Dickinson College

Cotten Seiler


Scholars working on gender, the body, and/or disability will find helpful three recent books in history, sociology, and communication. Each breaks new ground in insisting that individuals use bodies as sites to articulate and materialize definitions of status, beauty, normalcy, and health. Although they leave the reader with varying levels of satisfaction, all are well worth the attention of those who teach and write about the relationship between bodies and culture.

Of these texts, the most useful for practitioners of American Studies is Debra Gimlin’s Body Work: Beauty and Self-Image in American Culture. A sociologist by training, Gimlin enters four spaces—the hair salon, the aerobics studio, the cosmetic surgeon’s office, and the fat person’s support group—to reveal the actual experiences of women who undergo what she terms “body work,” labors designed to repair what Gimlin calls the “flawed identities that perfect bodies symbolize” (5). The phrase itself is useful, in that it imagines bodies not as they are socially constructed by outside forces, but rather as malleable entities upon which the self is continuously negotiated through processes like hair styling, exercise, cosmetic surgery, and socializing. Gimlin argues that within modern society, women cannot help but be exposed to unrealistic ideas of beauty. Yet she insists that it is overly simplistic to say that women’s attempts to shape their bodies is a sign of their oppression by these ideals. Instead, she argues, body work allows women to “negotiate normative identities.” On the one hand, they internalize social beauty standards and work to achieve them. On the other hand, the very practice of working to achieve these standards frees them from culpability for not doing so. Gimlin discovers in her research that women frequently engage in body work to achieve not a perfect body (which most know is unattainable), but a more comfortable sense of themselves. In the aerobics study this means women are aware of the mandate to be thin and admittedly impacted by it (many have a few pounds they would like to lose), but enjoy the class primarily for companionship, affirmation, and the sense of
physical power it provides. While at times Gimlin does not carry her argument through the book (brief conclusions at the end of each chapter try to pull much material together quickly), and fails to adequately distinguish between disparate acts of body work (aerobics, cosmetic surgery, and hair care represent dramatically different degrees of physical intervention and control), the richness of evidence and approach outweighs problems with cohesion. The real strength of Gimlin’s work is that she is able to understand women’s engagement with their bodies and beauty culture as simultaneously complicit and contentious.

Kathleen LeBesco also wants us to think about the relationship between bodies and self definition. In *Revolting Bodies: The Struggle to Redefine Fat Identity*, LeBesco, a communication scholar, uses rhetorical analysis to re-read fat bodies. LeBesco’s uses Judith Butler’s work as a foundation for her argument that we can speak our way out of fat oppression, to reconstruct it “so that it is not considered bad or dirty” (24). What is particularly of interest to cultural studies scholars is LeBesco’s succinct chapter outlining the process by which fat was culturally constructed as undesirable and her chapter analyzing listserv communication as a means by which individuals can reclaim “fat” as a positive signifier. LeBesco’s insistence that the problem and solution to the problem of fat oppression lies exclusively in language, however, at times weakens her argument. She rightfully criticizes the violence done by what she terms “interventions” targeted at obesity, or public health officials’ cultural constructions of fat as an unhealthy epidemic (32). Yet it would be easier to dismiss these anti-fat voices, were she to acknowledge the complexity of celebrating fat, a condition that can contribute to ill health and become physically impairing. While LeBesco can hardly be faulted for the importance of the political work she is doing here, more ambiguity in her analysis would leave readers better able to understand the complexity of redefining fat.

*Fat Boys: A Slim Book* is a welcome survey of representations of male obesity in western culture. Historian Sander Gilman uses character studies of what he terms “fat boys” from antiquity to the present, to “negotiate the complexities of defining the healthy and the ill” (17). As Gilman states in the introduction, body scholarship has long focused on women to the exclusion of men, yet until the last fifty men have been the primary obese subjects in western literature and medicine. Here Gilman attempts to reclaim the fat male body as an object worthy of cultural study by analyzing fat boys in history and literature. Gilman’s approach, to deconstruct representative fat boys to uncover a period’s deeper cultural values, is particularly successful in his chapter on the Fat Detective. Here Gilman reveals the fat body as the intuitive body. He sees the intellectual superiority demonstrated by fat detectives and fat villains not as a coincidence, but a result of scientific theories positing fat as an essential substance for insulating nerves and speeding mental functioning. Also of particular value to American Studies scholars working on the body is Gilman’s conclusion where he briefly explores gender distinctions in how contemporary men and women connect fat bodies with their sense of identity. His analysis suggests that men’s sense of self remains stable regardless of weight while women feel dramatically altered by a dramatic weight-loss experience. *Fat Boys* is an important beginning to a project where much work remains to be done.

All three books offer rich insights for our field. LeBesco’s insistence that the way we talk about bodies does do violence and could produce liberation invites more thoughtful analyses of body rhetoric. Gilman’s broad stroke exploration of body characterizations reminds us that there is no purely “American” body for analysis but rather an inheritance of body attitudes across nations, spaces, and times. And Gimlin’s
engagement with the complexity of living bodies reminds us that appearances, while much in the field of body studies, cannot be allowed to be all.

UC Davis Carolyn Thomas de la Peña


Combining a traditionalist strand of literary criticism with elements of gender and masculinity studies, Crain’s book examines male friendship and love as both theme and structuring influence in the relationships of four elite male American writers from the late eighteenth to the late nineteenth centuries. After an introduction on the early national fascination with Major John André, the study examines John Fishbourne Mifflin, whose genteel romantic relationships with James Gibson and Isaac Norris III produced extensive diaries in the 1780s; Charles Brockden Brown, whose correspondence with a circle of friends served as a laboratory for developing his literary ambitions in the 1790s; Emerson and the antebellum writings that register his early crush on a male fellow student and later triangular relationships with Fuller, Samuel Gray Ward, and Anna Hazard Barker; and Melville, whose early friendship with fellow sailor Jack Chase is taken as an occasion for a reading of the homoerotic elements in “Billy Budd,” from the 1880s.

The book’s primary contribution is its biographically oriented close readings of personal writings, primarily diaries, letters, and notebooks, that trace out the vicissitudes of homosociality and homoeroticism in these four specific cases. At their best, these readings provide detailed glimpses into modalities of upper-class male friendship as these figures lived it. For Brown and Emerson, for example—and despite the study’s recycling of outdated commonplaces concerning the development of Brown’s career and differences between his earlier and later fiction—this kind of reading produces insights into ways each figure managed and responded to the complexities of male romantic friendships as he developed as a writer. The study’s exclusively biographical and psychological approach is less successful, however, when it argues the centrality of these relationships for an understanding of these writers’ published works. That is, the study is persuasive in establishing that male romance is a significant element in the cultural and intellectual development of these particular writers, but less so in developing general insights into the role of homosociality and homoeroticism in these writers’ publicly-oriented writings or in “literature” in general.

The study argues that these writers sublimate homosocial and homoerotic experience in writings that compensate for its loss, thereby making this “sentimental configuration” a “special task of American literature.” (239, 2). At least two major factors make this thesis problematic. First, the study’s insights are not generalizable on its own terms; it focuses exclusively on the psychological interpretation of personal relationships considered in isolation and does not understand these relationships or the texts it examines in terms of wider historical trends, institutions, or practices. The readings are adept at developing literary allusions and references, but do little to relate their subject matter outward to the historical circumstances and transformations that produce and condition it. Second, the deeply psychologistic and aestheticized models of subjectivity and literature used here reinforce the self-contained, ahistorical tendency of the readings because they do not recognize subjectivity, sexuality, and literature as historical or contingent categories. Summarily rejecting the entirety of queer theory and poststructuralism (inexplicably characterized as “metaphysical” in the discussion of
Melville; 244-46, cf. 151-52), the study relies instead on unreflected, essentialist concepts of subjectivity and literature that seem nostalgic for an earlier era in scholarship. Nevertheless, if one considers this material in light of work on subjectivity, aesthetics, and the development of modernity by figures such as Foucault, Bourdieu, Eagleton, or Habermas, or in light of familiar work on gender, sexuality, and culture associated with Foucault and Butler, the study provides a wealth of information illuminating the crucial role of aesthetics in the development of bourgeois subjectivity and modes of sexuality.

University of Kansas
Philip Barnard


According to Emerson’s 1838 “Divinity School Address,” “There is no doctrine of the Reason which will bear to be taught by the Understanding”—a stricture that would seem to set Emerson at odds with a project like Understanding Emerson. Sacks, aware of Emerson’s hierarchical distinction between Kantian Reason and Lockean Understanding, foregrounds that dialectic in a study sympathetic to Emerson, especially in the personal sense. Sacks seeks to understand an Emerson connected to the social world, struggling to live the demanding doctrines of his Reason.

Softening the Reason/Understanding distinction, Sacks reminds us that for Kant, knowledge “begins with experience” (8-9). In 1836’s Nature, Emerson had himself given a more harmonious version of the dichotomy: “The understanding adds, divides, combines, measures”; “Reason transfers all these lessons” into thought. Splitting the difference between Nature and “Divinity,” Sacks’ study focuses on what he takes to be Emerson’s decisive utterance, 1837’s “The American Scholar.” In Nature, Emerson integrates the “lessons” of the Understanding in the chapter that precedes “Idealism”; charting a similar course, Understanding Emerson unveils an “American Scholar” that “succeeds precisely because its idealism arose out of historical circumstances” (121). Assimilating previous contextualizations, Sacks investigates anew the “why” that occasioned this particular performance (19). Sacks concludes that because Emerson “labored to become the very scholar he proposed to his audience, the oration is mainly about Emerson himself” (4), a self that Sacks nevertheless finds amidst “peers” and addressing a well-defined “public” (2,3).

Among the peers, fullest treatment goes to Bronson Alcott, whom Sacks characterizes as Emerson’s radical conscience, spurring him to the “powerful polemics” of “the combative scholar” (114, 118). Emerson once complained of a Hawthorne text that it had “no inside to it,” and that neither did the author: “He & Alcott together would make a man.” Sacks gives “The American Scholar” an “inside,” notably by presenting Alcott as Emerson’s needed other half, who conveyed the “example and expectations” of action (120). Highlighting Emerson’s continual struggle to reconcile self-reliance with his need for external motivation, Sacks’ book amplifies Lawrence Buell’s chapter on “Emersonian Self-Reliance in Theory and Practice” in Emerson (Harvard, 2003).

Scrutinizing the receiving end of “The American Scholar,” Sacks outlines a “Harvard-Unitarian culture” from whose values Emerson’s oration made “a complete break” (16). Sacks tracks down who sat in that original audience, and how previous
speakers had addressed them, to clarify the sweeping import of Emerson’s appropriation of “American Scholar” discourse: “Used previously with nationalistic and moral overtones, for Emerson it signified freedom from all prescribed culture and convention” (31). In questioning the rhetorical function of “America in The American Scholar” (21-31), Sacks’ work complements Buell’s section that asks, “How American Was Emerson’s ‘American Scholar’?”

Like Sacks’ study, Fresonke’s West of Emerson may be read as a thorough contextualization of a canonical literary work or two. Though it offers manifold insights, its centerpiece question could be re-stated, How was Emerson’s Nature American? Fresonke’s clearest answer takes the negative: not in the land-grabbing manner of Manifest Destiny. Noting that Nature “has seldom been read politically,” Fresonke rectifies matters by dwelling patiently on the theological backgrounds and contemporary “Jacksonian design” from which Emerson’s ecstatic vision departs (113, 115). Whereas Sacks sometimes constrains his analysis by taking at face value Emerson’s private disavowals of philosophy (84, 125), Fresonke, in her intricate consideration of Nature’s epistemology, sets no such limitations on a Reasoning Emerson.

And she paints a broader canvas. Sacks’ revision takes admirable care with the usual suspects (weighing an overlooked letter from Aunt Mary Moody, overturning a misunderstood relation to Frederic Henry Hedge) to rethink Emerson’s relation to New England Transcendentalism. Fresonke’s intervention shakes out the lineup, rethinking the place of New England’s literary visions in stories of the continent. Here we encounter—as does Emerson—the roller derby queen of San Francisco and learn of Heinrich Schliemann, forty-niner (127, 18). Reading Emerson and Thoreau within and against the tradition of western exploration narrative, Fresonke works with a “process” model of culture rather than a strict “‘influence’ model of literature” (28). The complete Lewis and Clark Journals, though unpublished until the twentieth century, merit attention as telling responses to an unfolding process, rather than as precursor texts. Even so, Fresonke carefully establishes Emerson’s immersion in reading “exploration accounts the way others might read a serialized novel” alongside his better-know interests in natural theology (105). Deeply learned in a “desecularized Enlightenment history” (29), Fresonke’s contextualization of Emerson and Thoreau bears comparison to the project concurrently announced in Jay Grossman’s Reconstituting the American Renaissance (Duke, 2003) of reading Emerson and Whitman within “an American version of the long eighteenth century.”

Teachers of American culture will thank Sacks for synthesizing an important nineteenth-century episode, handy for review before class. Fresonke’s beautifully-crafted and intellectually-generative work I already find myself bringing to class, to read aloud.

University of Texas, Austin
Martin Kevorkian


The Bowery boys are antebellum New York City’s most famous and elusive social group. Walt Whitman glorified them; Frank Chafrau personified them in his popular theatrical stereotype of Mose, the fireboy; respectable people blamed most riot and rowdiness on them; contemporary writers on the urban underside reveled in their tough shenanigans and subsequent historians of the working class, like Peter Adams, connect
them to proletariat proto-rebellion. Yet they have little human or historical dimension beyond this lively urban legend.

Adams sets out to correct “the healthy dose of exaggeration” in Herbert Asbury’s popular book and Martin Scorsese’s recent film, *The Gangs of New York* (p. xi). He covers the political aspect of the topic more fully than before, but the “b’hoys” remain elusive, essentially the unidentified shock troops for writers and politicians. Mike Walsh is Adam’s central character, whose “Spartan Band” disrupted and enlivened New York City life and Democratic politics between 1840 and the mid-1850s. Arthur Schlesinger Jr. and Sean Wilentz, in their search for a working-class tribune, earlier made Walsh a demi-hero, a role he retains in Adams’ fuller handling. While admitting Walsh’s shoddy tactics and the difficulty of separating his “convictions” from “his rank opportunism,” Adams presents him as leading a major protest against capitalism that gave direction to “a decade of anger among the city’s industrial proletariat” (pp. 16, 32).

Walsh’s rhetoric was often amusingly searing against the exploitation of working men and against any opponent, none of whom he despised more than Martin Van Buren and Tammany. The latter, he said, told workers they were “the bone and sinew of the country” before elections, and afterwards they “use us until we are only bone and sinew” (p. 14). He supported several reform causes, but none that didn’t draw wide support from other groups. He also exulted in violence, leading some riots against rival Democrats, and verbally, but not directly, supporting the Astor Place riot and the Dorr War, incidents Adams reprises. Yet Walsh’s proslavery, xenophobic, and anti-black/Mexican/semetic stances, and his praise of progress machines, imperialism and laissez-faire hardly suggest serious “protest to the emerging capitalist order” (p. 26). Neither did Walsh’s proclaiming President John Tyler “one of the b’hoys,” nor his idolization of John C. Calhoun.

Adams uses material well from Walsh’s *Subterranean*, though without much attention to that newspaper’s involvement with scandal and blackmail. Adams also offers portraits of Walsh’s circle: collaborators David Broderick and George Wilkes; respectable radicals George Henry Evans and John G. Commerford; and rivals in political rascality Levi Slamm, Isaiah Rynders, and Ned Buntline, whose eratic rhetoric and tactics paralleled Walsh’s. Adams oddly defines some minor players. Buntline opposed industrialization; Orestes Brownson was a socialist; C.C. Cambrelen a labor organizer; and Thomas Skidmore a pre-Bolshevik “advocate of class war on an international scale” (p. 65). Yet the deeper question involves the conventional wisdom Adams supports. Did these leaders speak much to or for American workers”? The evidence makes clear only that they speak to historians in search of an American radical tradition.

University of Maryland, College Park

David Grimsted


Here are two well-researched and intelligently argued books that expressively take up the imperial mindset in American history. Robert E. May’s *Manifest Destiny’s Underworld* is a nearly encyclopedic study of the 1850s, heyday of the filibuster, or private military expedition. May presents all sides of the issue in stunning detail, connecting the bold, sometimes incomprehensible, actions of the Venezuelan-American Narciso Lopez and the onetime Mississippi governor John A. Quitman, both in Cuba;
and the “Gray-Eyed Man of Destiny,” William Walker, in Nicaragua. Secondary players include President Franklin Pierce, the irrepressible editor John L. O’Sullivan, famous for coining the term “manifest destiny,” and a host of lesser names, Yankee and Spaniard alike, whose urgent appeals demonstrate over and over just how agitated people were over the phenomenon of filibustering in the decade that preceded the Civil War.

Pierce, for one, is a surprisingly complex figure. While appointing filibusters to consular offices, he sought (only half-successfully) to separate his administration from the filibustering legions—simply to pave the way for Washington’s diplomatic acquisition of Cuba. The southern proslavery component in these foreign adventures, while undeniable, did not mean that northern collaboration was slight: New York City played a key role in filibustering preparations.

Some of May’s best analysis involves his research into the lives of ordinary recruits. Often Mexican War veterans in search of further adventure, they also tended to be in dire need of sustenance, suffering deprivation every step along the way to their probable defeat. What euphoria there was never lasted. Federal officials disparaged the filibuster type as a vulgar, dishonorable representative of American resolve. William Walker and his “Immortals” were seen, in this way, as pirates and plunderers, not heroic individualists. But Walker’s charismatic presence was felt, nonetheless, whether in public appearances in the U.S. or in tales of his four reckless expeditions. After assuming leadership in Nicaragua in 1856, and hanging on until troops pushed his small force back to the sea, Walker was eventually captured and executed. None of the filibusters ever raised a significant army; all were ignorantly assured that the natives would welcome them with open arms.

May notes that representations of Latin Americans as “cowardly” fed Americans’ infatuation with private military expeditions, a dangerous delusion that has never been forgotten south of the border. He concludes that filibustering actually impeded U.S. expansionism by alerting other nations to Washington’s unpredictability and its condoning of violence that served its economic interest.

The key to Brady Harrison’s captivating study, Agent of Empire, is a concept of “performative masculinity.” For Harrison, Walker is the prototype of the mercenary romance in literature and film. The “imperial self” finds its embodiment in the rugged individualist, chivalric as of old, and thoroughly convinced of the appropriateness of the American conquest of lesser peoples; furious visionaries hate the people they ostensibly go abroad to help—what the author refers to as the “vicious ontology of the imperial self and the imperial other” (117).

Harrison is responsive to the work (and expository style) of Richard Slotkin, Walter LaFeber, and Gail Bederman. He focuses on the post-Walker world, from Bret Harte’s portrayal of Walker as con man, to the heavy-handed Richard Harding Davis (the best-selling writer cast as agent of empire); there are compelling allusions to Gore Vidal’s Dark Green, Bright Red (1950), Joan Didion’s A Book of Common Prayer (1977), Oliver Stone’s Platoon (1986), and the real Ollie North of Nicaraguan contra distinction.

Davis is perhaps the most interesting subject of study here. His first book, Soldier of Fortune (1897), “firmly embedded the mercenary romance in American culture,” writes Harrison (80). Theodore Roosevelt sneered at the self-obsessed Davis as “so entirely unintelligent that it was a little difficult to argue with him” (83); yet one infers from Harrison’s later discussion of Roosevelt that Davis was merely a meaner version of TR, a fanatic lacking in the deeper principles of that masculine virtue conventionally associated with the “Rough Rider” president. Harrison dissects Davis’s life, pointing to
his failure at love and his need to find another dramatic outlet for his driving passion. Harrison’s concluding rumination about George W. Bush’s Iraq adventure is a tentative pre-history of future historians’ inevitable return to this subject—assessing the American psychology of winning, losing, and fantasizing international rescues, or Bush as a Byronic hero without the poetry.

The “Young American” or “romantic mercenary” paradigm is pretty straightforward: The would-be filibuster feels out of place professionally, frustrated personally, and sees foreign adventure as a means to redemption or reversal of fortune. The campaign provides a clear-cut way out of the muddle, no matter what the odds. Desperation—and racist motivations—are subsumed in belief in the nobility of the cause. Richard Slotkin’s long-ago articulated “regeneration through violence” still provides us with the overarching theme.

University of Tulsa

Andrew Burstein


Toward the end of Steven Stowe’s study of doctoring and everyday life in the antebellum South, the author recuperates the life story of a relatively obscure Southern physician, John Young Bassett, a graduate of Baltimore’s Washington Medical College in 1828, who visited Paris medical clinics for several months before settling down with his wife and new medical practice in Huntsville, Alabama. Only one of many life narratives Stowe examines in this book, Bassett lived and worked in Huntsville until he died of consumption at the age of 46. For me, Bassett is the most interesting of the small town Southern practitioners whose lives Stowe pieces together through casebooks, letters, and occasional published writings. In one way or another, they are all exemplars of the “country orthodox practice” (2) that Stowe identifies and details. Despite numerous accounts of the modernizing, post Civil War medical model ushered in by laboratory medicine and the germ theory, Stowe uses these narratives to argue that a traditional doctoring style persisted among orthodox physicians well into the 1880’s and 90’s. Though focused on the South, the author suggests that other regional modes of rural practice shared certain characteristics are also worth investigating.

Like the other practitioners whose textured lives the author interprets, John Young Bassett’s challenge was to balance his faith in the professional knowledge he received in medical school, the intuitive wisdom of bedside “experience,” and the demands of patients embedded in a specific community culture and a particular locale (the rural South), with his personal and professional moral sensibility as an orthodox practitioner. While several of Stowe’s chosen individuals derived a sense of harmony and gratification from their ties to community, Bassett, Stowe finds, though equally “a man of his town and his times,” was a harsh critic of the ignorance, reckless behavior, moral laxity, and rampant self-interest of his neighbors. He railed against alternative healers, the selfishness of his fellow allopaths, and the sometimes violent recalcitrance of his neighbors, who not only offended his morality, but, equally important, kept him from practicing what he felt was good medicine.

While Stowe characterizes Bassett’s assessment of his community as an aspect of his commitment to orthodox country practice and its embeddedness in the collective concerns he so richly documents in several chapters of the book, he allows that Bassett’s
story has been interpreted differently. No less a figure than Sr. William Osler, one of the founders of Johns Hopkins Medical School and probably the best-known propagandist for modern scientific medicine, memorialized Bassett in 1896 in an essay entitled “An Alabama Student.” Required reading for medical aspirants well into the 20th century, Osler’s portrait of Bassett rendered him a precursor of things to come—a man before his time who was able to imagine a better medical world while continuing to hone his inquisitive skills in the name of understanding and conquering disease. Osler’s powerful ideological re-framing of what went before, devised with the intention of giving medical orthodoxy a modern face (and still contributing to contemporary understandings of the trajectory of medical progress) is exactly the narrative Stowe wishes to temper as he highlights the complex and competing exigencies of daily practice. There is much documented here for the scholar to think about: the Southern experience, with its racially inflected social system that threaded through every aspect of medical theory and treatment; the particular cast of the southern character, herein explored through notions of masculinity; the particularities of region; alternative healing systems, including those preferred by ex-slaves; physicians’ relationship to slavery; the myriad and sometimes competing tensions, challenges, and demands of medical professionalism and allegiance to lay communities. Stowe’s emphasis is on the slowness of historical change, the persistence of the past into the present, and how history plays itself out in places and spaces far removed from the faster-paced centers of innovative transformation—found more often in mainstream narratives of scholarly interest.

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Regina Morantz-Sanchez


By historicizing the flag culture of the Confederacy, this imaginatively conceived interdisciplinary work offers fresh insights into the popular culture and nationalist commitment of the Confederate South. From the first banners unfurled in defiance of federal authority during the secession winter of 1860-61 through the proliferation of battlefield flags and the selection of designs for the official national flags of the Confederacy, Bonner shows how “these waving swathes of cloth acquired their enormous power to inspire and to repel” (p.2). The flags were visual symbols of a whole range of emotions mobilized in the Southern bid for political independence and the most common way in which popular patriotism was expressed. The cultural forms generated by these flags—the poetry, songs, and community rituals of presenting flags sewn by local women to departing troops—conveyed and popularized an ongoing debate over the collective meaning of the war and of Confederate nationalism.

Bonner’s freshest insights derive from his realization that the public at large, not the civilian and military elites, were the driving element in the distinctive stages of wartime flag culture that emerged. He stresses that “Confederate banners were adopted and understood by the larger southern public in a series of fits and starts” (p.15), which, in turn, can be seen as a popular referendum over how the Confederate cause should be symbolically represented. The official visual representation of the Confederacy to the outside world was its national flag. Consistent with the moderation and striving for a broad consensus that characterized the establishment of a government for the Confederacy at the Montgomery Convention in February, 1861, the first national flag, the Stars and Bars, incorporated no colors or visual designs that would link the Confederacy to slavery.
Proposals for such a link, unsurprisingly, came primarily from the most radical of the Southern states, South Carolina. By adopting for the national flag a modified version of the old “Stars and Stripes,” the founders of the Confederacy proclaimed that their cause was to rescue and preserve the true spirit of American patriotism from the perversions of the fanatical abolitionists who controlled the Republican party.

Public reaction to the Stars and Bars was lukewarm at best. To many Southern whites, it smacked too much of the very Union they wanted to leave. On a more pragmatic level, it so closely resembled the enemy’s flag that confusion was inevitable in the heat of battle. In the fall of 1861, the War Department authorized a new battle flag for the Confederate army, commonly called the Southern Cross after its most prominent feature, an X-shaped blue cross. This was the design adopted by the Confederate Congress in 1863 for a new national flag—a white field with the Southern Cross superimposed in the upper right corner—known as the Stainless Banner. Here was a design that attracted primal passions and loyalties with an intensity the civilian-oriented Stars and Bars could never match. Its popularity to this very day as the preeminent symbol of the Confederacy attests to the process by which battlefield deaths and sacrifice, sanctified in the public mind as the selfless offerings of holy warriors, eclipsed nationalist themes of political independence as the focal point of Southern identification with the cause of the Confederacy.

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

William L. Barney


The African American quest for freedom and equality in the wake of slavery remains one of the most compelling and frustrating episodes in American history. Historians such as Leon Litwack and Joel Williamson have written magisterial studies of black emancipation, but seldom have scholars carried their research beyond the late nineteenth century. Paul Ortiz’s excellent study, Emancipation Betrayed. The Hidden History of Black Organizing and White Violence in Florida from Reconstruction to the Bloody Election of 1920, contributes significantly to the historiography of Reconstruction and its aftermath. Unlike most reconstruction era scholars, Ortiz carries his research into the early decades of the twentieth century and shows a long tradition of racial activism and armed resistence by African Americans to secure their civil rights and to protect their lives.

For the majority of black Floridians, the reconstruction era represented not merely a failure, but to paraphrase W. E. B. Du Bois, “a splendid failure.” African American aspirations to own land, to vote, to work for wages, to educate their children, and to protect their families, clashed with the stark and ugly reality of white supremacy and capitalism. Neither southern white Democrats nor Republicans, argues Ortiz, proposed any meaningful programs to assist Florida’s freedmen. Instead, Florida passed a Black Code that subjected African Americans to forced labor, apprenticeship laws and vagrancy, if they refused to work. While African Americans were encouraged by their leaders as well as their own instincts to become small independent landowners, to vote, and to work for wages, Florida’s large landowners, many of whom were former slave owners, were reluctant to pay fair wages to their former slaves. Securing small homesteads proved equally problematic, for white-dominated Florida legislatures, writes
Ortiz, “deeded hundred of thousands of acres of land to English land syndicates and railroads.” (21)

The post-Reconstruction era offered black Floridians little promise as well. However, African American did not passively succumb to white supremacy. African American men and women collectively organized their communities to boycott segregated public accommodations such as streetcars, formed women’s clubs and mutual aid societies, established churches and labor unions, and occasionally forged political alliances. They also conducted voter registration drives, as the franchise was viewed as an important ingredient in obtaining full citizenship. Yet white Floridians, notes Ortiz, had as much sympathy for black attempts to vote as the had earlier for the desire of African Americans to own land. Whites brutally attempted to suppress African American political assertiveness, culminating in 1920 in a reign of terror and murder orchestrated by the Ku Klux Klan. The NAACP’s national office estimated conservatively that between thirty and sixty African Americans were murdered on election day in Florida in 1920. Hundreds of others were driven from the polls by organized white paramilitary groups.

Emancipation Betrayed is a tragic story in many respects. Ortiz, however, through an impressive array of primary sources such as newspapers, oral interviews, federal and state documents, and manuscript collections, including the papers of the NAACP, has done far more than simply write a history of African American victimization. He has introduced us to many obscure figures for the first time, such as Dr. W. S. Stevens and Eartha White, who fought for freedom in their attempt to gain a full measure of citizenship for African Americans. Ortiz has also demonstrated convincingly that there was much greater continuity in the black freedom struggle in the South than historians had heretofore believed.

Texas A&M University

Albert S. Broussard


Not the least of this book’s many strengths is the romance of love and betrayal, told, as Karen Lystra puts it, “in an essentially novelistic style.” At the heart of the story is a triangle—the preferred geometry of all tales of “dangerous intimacy”—comprising the aging widower Samuel Clemens; his youngest daughter Jean, who struggled with epilepsy; and Isabel Lyon, a secretary and household manager hired after the death of Clemens’s wife Livy. From nearly the beginning of her employment, Lyon—depressive and alcoholic—was deeply infatuated with her employer, going so far as to dream of becoming the second wife of “the King,” as she called him. She never succeeded in realizing that goal, but her near obsessive devotion to Clemens, her jealousy of Jean’s (and others’) claims on his affections, along with his willingness to hand over all personal responsibility to women, led to near-disastrous results.

If all this makes for a page-turner, it also represents fine scholarship. Lystra’s meticulous research overturns a century of commentary that has cast Jean and the older daughter Clara as harpies intent on besmirching the good names of Lyon and her eventual husband Ralph Ashcroft, an invidious Englishman first retained to help with Clemens’ many business interests. Instead, argues Lystra, it was the employees who took advantage of Clemens’ vanity in attempting to lay claim to his attention, and finally his wealth. The result is a clear-eyed yet sympathetic portrait of the last years of the man known as Mark Twain.
Even more compelling is Lystra’s vivid reconstruction of the intimate life of a household complex and passionate enough to rival any imagined by Henry James. Lyon and the family she served both exploited, and fell prey to the shifting and ill-defined boundaries between domestic helper and family member that lay at the core of her job. Thus managing the household money led Lyon increasingly to spend it, often lavishly, as her own, even as she set and enforced often stringent living allowances for each adult daughter.

The most difficult, and heartbreaking intimacy Lyon entered into was that between Clemens and Jean. Anxious to the point of avoidance over his daughter’s illness, Clemens allowed his secretary to assume all contact with Jean and her doctors. In her jealousy and need for control, Lyon all but quarantined daughter from father in a series of sanitariums and medical way-stations. Lystra’s best work comes when she details the rigors and fears of medical treatment, showing how Jean in effect “became” her disease—how her doctors, her father, and most tragically, the patient herself, internalized the mix of medicine and myth surrounding epilepsy to the point where even the most casual relationship was evaluated in light of her treatment.

After Clemens uncovered Lyon’s and Ashcroft’s machinations, he enjoyed a brief period of happiness with the daughter he had all but abandoned, until she drowned after a grand mal seizure in the bath. With typically harsh veracity, he labeled himself “another stripped & forlorn King Lear,” a characterization that only now, after a century, makes sense to the rest of us.

College of William & Mary
Richard Lowry


Stephen Grant Meyer provides a very useful volume on the general history of racial discrimination in housing and the campaign for fair housing in twentieth-century America. Though the title does not denote the time span, the book surveys the period from the early 1900s through the passage of the Fair Housing Act in 1968. Meyer argues rightly that there has been no previous single volume examining this history which has been national in scope. In chronologically-arranged chapters, he considers the major developments regarding housing discrimination in each period, then provides place-specific episodes, drawn from selected cities and regions. He also traces the growth of the campaign for fair housing, explaining the scope of the developing civil rights coalition that formed around this issue and its struggle through activism, major court cases, and legislation (at the local, state, and federal levels). His survey makes use of an extensive range of sources, including unpublished papers from municipal archives and advocacy organizations (such as the papers of the NAACP); documents from federal housing and civil rights agencies; press accounts, drawn from newspapers (including the African American press); as well as the voluminous secondary literature related to this significant subject.

Meyer argues persuasively that housing has proved the most intransigent domain of racial segregation. His first contention is that the pervasiveness and persistence of housing segregation illustrate clearly the national scope of racism. Meyer insists that the tendency of the early Civil Rights movement to identify the South as the distinctive locus for racist thought and practice, while effective in terms of the strategy to attack de
jure discrimination and the effort to gain allies, may have deflected consideration from recognition of the pervasiveness of de facto patterns and practices elsewhere. Similarly, Meyer contends that the effort of historians of the South to emphasize the peculiar circumstances that entrenched Jim Crow mechanisms of systematic segregation led to an overly hopeful interpretation that such developments represented regional aberrations that might be overcome and reversed over time. While he provides ample evidence of systematic resistance to residential integration outside the South, his own analysis may fail to take full account of the complex dynamics in the region stemming from slavery and its aftermath that produced stalwart white resistance to challenges to the racial status quo in housing or otherwise that was, in his own words, “so pervasive that it went almost unquestioned” until at least World War II (98). Secondly, Meyer takes issue with what he contends has been the position of some historians, social scientists, and housing activists that such institutional actors as government (federal housing and loan agencies, as well as federally-supported public housing authorities) and industry (real estate firms, loan institutions, and developers) should be principally fingered in explaining twentieth-century housing segregation. Rather, Meyer contends that their actions reflected more than they shaped patterns of “deep-seated racial prejudice” entrenched in public attitudes and behavior (viii). While this latter argument may indeed represent an important corrective, the more fundamental point may be to understand the way that institutional sectors and public behavior have interacted to create and maintain the dense web of racism illustrated in the residential sphere.

The volume is at its best in recounting significant episodes of housing discrimination from diverse settings and various regions of the country, based upon extensive use of local newspaper and other documentary sources. Some are familiar to students of housing issues, but the book makes a valuable contribution in drawing them together into a unified national narrative. Illustrative of the hardening Jim Crow wall of segregation in the early century was the device of residential segregation ordinances, pioneered in Baltimore in the early 1910s and replicated elsewhere. Though declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in a Louisville case in 1917 on the basis of property rights, rather than discrimination, Meyer finds evidence that they continued to be employed in some localities as late as the 1950s. The Great Migration of African Americans that accompanied both world wars brought new conditions that demonstrated the national dimensions of residential housing discrimination, one of Meyer’s major themes. As example, he provides detailed examination of episodes in Detroit—the 1920s Sweet case, in which an African American family had to defend itself from a violent mob, and the 1940s Sojourner Truth Homes episode, involving white resistance to African American residency in newly—constructed defense housing. A chapter on the South compares the situation in Atlanta, which claimed a New South reputation for greater tolerance (“the city too busy to hate”), and Birmingham, long regarded as a bastion of segregation, pointing out their commonality in resistance to desegregated housing and the violence endemic to both. Meyer chronicles the fight against restrictive covenants which led to the break-through Supreme Court decision of 1948 declaring them unenforceable, but notes that housing always played a secondary role in the Civil Rights Movement as it gained momentum in the 1950s and 1960s. Indeed, when Martin Luther King’s non-violent movement turned northward to Chicago in the mid-1960s and made the decision to target housing opportunity, the Civil Rights Movement met one of its greatest defeats in confronting de facto residential segregation in a Northern city. Meyer also surveys the history of government policy on housing. He traces the major
developments at the federal level from the New Deal through the Fair Deal and the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, acknowledging the discriminatory policies of early federal programs supporting housing—including urban renewal, public housing, and home loans—and chronicling the movement for fair housing legislation which culminated in the 1968 Fair Housing Act.

Meyer provides substantial evidence for the persistence of resistance to residential integration and the violence often accompanying that resistance. However, the national scope of his survey and the nature of his methodology result in a narrative which does not do full justice either to the complex structures which have undergirded separation or to those which have operated in processes of racial change. Particular episodes of location-specific crisis regarding attempts to expand African American housing opportunities are told in cases when they were met by violence or otherwise became the focus of activism, thereby making their way into the public record, but quieter and more subtle forms of residential containment are left unexplored. And while the chronicle of developments in various cities helps to provide a sense of the national dimensions of the problem, the incidents are not placed in a context which conveys a clear picture of the scale and scope of patterns of racial residency—either in periods of hardened lines or in those when boundaries expanded. This latter shortcoming is most relevant in terms of the post-World War II decades when the traditional props of residential segregation began to crumble in a process of massive white flight to outer city areas and newer suburbs, desperately needed living space for African Americans expanded, but re-segregation rather than desegregation typically resulted. Moreover, real estate practices like steering and redlining, which served to maintain residential segregation, and blockbusting, which brought profits to those engaged in magnifying racial panic, receive less attention than they deserve.

Committed to portraying the history of twentieth-century race and housing in realistic terms, Meyer concludes persuasively that while the movement to remove the vestiges of legal support for residential segregation generally has succeeded, the broader aims of housing opportunity continue to fall short of fulfillment.

University of Maryland Baltimore County

W. Edward Orser


At the height of its drawing power in the first half of the twentieth century, Atlantic City, according to Bryant Simon’s richly detailed and tightly argued book, served more than a site for entertainment. For millions of Americans, it became the place to assert one’s arrival in the middle class. Offering a sense of luxury at reasonable prices, the city’s ornate hotels, movie theaters, and especially its boardwalk, gave visitors the chance as part of the crowd to show they had made it in America. Such rituals of inclusion depended fully, however, on the exclusion of unwanted social elements, whether it was African Americans beyond those fulfilling the prescribed role of docilely serving visitors or any other element failing to conform to tightly prescribed rules of decorum. Once these rules were challenged, the nation’s premier playground fell apart. Its subsequent reincarnation as a gaming destination has drawn back the crowds, but at the expense of the city and its remaining residents.

Simon’s narrative evokes powerful images of each stage in the city’s changing trajectory. In the early years, Atlantic City’s ethnic neighborhoods exemplified qualities
of friendliness and mutuality that once characterized such places across urban America. Hotels bent the law by offering liquor during Prohibition and gambling well before it was legalized, but if there were victims they were willing, and crime was never a drag on community formation. Beyond the premier tourist destinations along the ocean, in the city’s Northside section white tourists could safely experience titillating performances from black entertainers specially crafted for them. The famed Miss America Pageant provided but one more opportunity for visitors to relax traditional constraints without, however, ever violating basic rules of decency.

Such carefully orchestrated rituals could not last forever. Simon cites a number of factors that undercut Atlantic City’s appeal, including the rising affluence that offered vacationers a wider range of home entertainment options as well as other destinations that could be reached cheaply by air. But what fundamentally undercut the city’s appeal, he argues, was the growing presence of undesirables: blacks, hippies, and gays. Challenging the restraints that made Atlantic City so normative to the middle class, civil rights, gay, counter culture youth, and women’s activists, made their presence known, and white tourists stayed away as a result. As revenues fell, so did the tenor and decorum of the place. Gimmicks ambitious urban renewal plans failed to stem decline. Finally, the city and state seized on gambling as a magic solution. Not surprisingly, a revived tourism destination found new ways to practice exclusion, through construction of highly policed and surveyed spaces that resemble enclosed suburban malls and gated communities more than public bazaars. Hopes that new revenues would revitalize the city as a whole were dashed, however, as casinos did their utmost to prevent their patrons from ever leaving their premises. Even as business profits, residents are left with crumbs, a condition Simon suggests that is all too common among the many cities that have sought to engineer their revitalization by reinventing themselves as tourist destinations. Thus, he asserts, is Atlantic City’s failure linked with that of contemporary urban America.

Rutgers University-Camden


In From Girl to Woman, literary scholar Christy Rishoi draws upon the disciplines of history, philosophy, anthropology, and psychology and utilizes the insights of postmodernism and post-structuralism to limn the contours of twentieth-century American women’s coming-of-age narratives. Rishoi treats these narratives as a distinct genre, different from the male Bildungsroman in their topic (by definition, the narratives Rishoi treats focus on women’s lives), their timing (women’s narratives of coming of age continue well into adulthood and often end in media res), and their themes (women’s narratives construct a self-in-relation rather than an autonomous, individuated self).

Rishoi offers several tantalizing insights for her readers. Her treatment of women’s coming-of-age narratives rejects the either-or model of (men’s) search for individual achievement (quest) and (women’s) search for emotional fulfillment (romance). Rather than accepting this dichotomy, Rishoi contends that women’s coming-of-age stories combine quest and romance. Often, as in the case of Janie, the protagonist of Zora Neal Hurston’s Their Eyes Were Watching God, Rishoi examines women discovering and developing a strong sense of self within relationships. Rishoi also avoids searching for any “universal subjectivity,” instead focusing on particular authors and texts to uncover “a highly specified subjectivity,” firmly grounded in historical and cultural context (19).
Thus, after devoting her opening chapters to post-modern theories of subjectivity and distinct disciplinary perspectives on coming of age, Rishoi devotes the bulk of her slim volume to close readings of Annie Dillard’s 1987 *An American Childhood*, Anne Moody’s 1968 *Coming of Age in Mississippi*, Mary McCarthy’s 1955 *Memories of a Catholic Girlhood*, Kate Simons’s 1982 *Bronx Primitive*, Maxine Hong Kingston’s 1975 *The Woman Warrior*, and two books by Zora Neale Hurston: *Their Eyes Were Watching God* (1937) and *Dust Tracks on a Road* (1942). Ultimately, Rishoi argues that women claim agency in their autobiographical writings, where they construct “oppositional identities” (or, in the case of immigrant writers, “hybrid identities”) and craft “a sphere in which the dominant American ideologies of womanhood are frequently and radically challenged and profoundly revised” (8, 10, 133).

*From Girl to Woman* is an interdisciplinary endeavor. Rishoi draws upon the work of historian Joseph Kett, psychologists Carol Gilligan and Nancy Chodorow, anthropologist Margaret Mead, and philosopher Alison Jaggar, as well as theorists such as Michel Foucault, to produce a “feminist poststructuralist revision of subjectivity” (43) that pays special attention to awakening sexuality, gender consciousness, and role development and resists describing “a one-size-fits-all journey of development” (61). Rishoi’s success at utilizing interdisciplinary insights varies. She proves more adept, for instance, at applying psychological and philosophical theories of development than she does at incorporating historical ones, as when she ahistorically asserts that adolescence is “by definition a time of rebellion and resistance” (9). Even more seriously, the value of this book is impeded by a convoluted writing style. Although Rishoi draws upon multiple disciplines and offers valuable insights for scholars in a range of disciplines, *From Girl to Woman* will prove inaccessible to many scholars outside the field of literary criticism.

The University of Montana

Anya Jabour


These books focus upon direct law making by assembled voters, and enactment and repeal of laws by the initiative and the protest referendum, respectively.

Few scholars have studied the primary assembly on a statewide basis and only Bryan has collected reliable data permitting correlation analysis of factors influencing annual town meeting attendance. He examines Vermont meetings, and presents attendance data, classified by men and women, and those who speak and the length of their public talk. The average meeting lasts three and one-half hours. His students collected attendance and other data at 1,435 town meetings in 210 towns since 1969. The data revealed: “Real Democracy works better in small places—dramatically better” (p. 83). He identified the Australian (secret) ballot, bad weather, and night meetings in large towns as responsible for decreased attendance, and recommended night meeting abandonment. Voter participation is higher in towns holding the annual town meeting in conjunction with the annual school district meeting. Special town meeting attendance tends to be very low compared to the annual meeting.

A chapter on “attendance: the context of community” describes the post 1960 immigration to Vermont, decline in farming, impact of the Interstate Highway, and a
“disconnect between SES and real democracy” (p. 117). Attendance declined from an average of 26.7% at 185 meetings during 1970-75 to 16.0% at 273 meetings during 1994-98 (p. 133), and led Bryan to conclude: “I am not altogether certain town meeting will survive the coming half-century even in Vermont, to say nothing of having a renewed future elsewhere in America” (p. 292). Fourteen Vermont towns replaced the open town meeting with the referendum town meeting where voters travel to the polls to make decisions on warning articles by secret ballot instead of assembling to debate them and make decisions, and Brattleboro adopted the representative town meeting (RTM) in which elected town meeting members possess all decision-making powers and follow open town meeting procedures.

Political scientists and others should explore actions to promote a higher participation rate by making the meeting more friendly, including a pre-town meeting “meeting” which examine the warning (warrant in other New England states), the moderator explaining procedures after opening the meeting and concluding business by 10 p.m., use of a consent calendar containing non-controversial articles, preparation and distribution to voters of a pamphlet describing town meeting procedures, provision of a baby-sitting service, transportation of elderly voters to and from the meeting, and biannual town meetings with the first focusing on the town budget and the second considering all other articles.

Goebel traces the roots of the initiative and protest referendum to Switzerland, describes their promotion by populists and progressives to break big business control of state legislatures, provides a broad survey of their use at the state level in the period 1890-1940, presents five short case studies of California initiative campaigns in the 1920s and 1930s, briefly reviews the recall, and devotes the last chapter to an abbreviated overview of post-1940 experience and conclusions. He also describes how direct democracy advocates mobilized the support of groups such as prohibitionists and the Grange, notes their limited success in the Northeast, Midwest, and South, and explains the political system in the West “was marked by greater electoral volatility, weaker parties, and interest groups willing to explore more innovative forms of furthering their agenda” (p. 108).

Paid signature collectors are traced to 1914 and emergence of direct democracy “as a useful tool in the arsenal of interest group politics” is highlighted (p. 153). Goebels concludes “the historical analysis of direct democracy since its inception a century ago makes abundantly clear that the initiative and referendum have never served, and probably never will serve, as the means to strengthen democracy in America, to truly build a government by the people” (p. 199).

This book provides a broad historical overview, but has flaws. A scholarly book should be based upon primary sources, yet the author quotes a 1903 Oregon Supreme Court decision and cites a secondary source. Similarly, reference is made to a U.S. Supreme Court decision and no citation is provided. While the author properly credits the role of the Populist and Progressive reform movements, he fails to refer to the administrative management reform (other than in Oregon), civil service, municipal reform, and short ballot movements which were part of the reform spirit in the late 19th and early 20th centuries and many of their members also were avid supporters of the initiative and protest referendum. Furthermore, it would have been helpful if the author employed Daniel J. Elazar political culture typology (*American Federalism: A View from the States*) to identify the states where the ground was fertile for the initiative and protest referendum.
The most serious criticism involves the author’s overgeneralization with respect to the effectiveness of the two participatory devices. It appears his major conclusion is based upon a brief post 1940 review of the generally atypical California experience with the initiative and its associated referendum. California without the initiative would not have had campaign finance reform, increased tobacco taxes, lobbying reform, the open primary, relief for property tax payers, and other reforms.

University of Albany
Joseph F. Zimmerman


It is a commonplace that jazz is an African American art form. Yet Joshua Berrett seeks to challenge this conventional wisdom, arguing that neither “African American” nor “art” accurately describes the music, if by art one refers to something divorced from popular culture. To advance this thesis, Berrett simultaneously explores the lives of two musicians who began their careers in the 1920s, Louis Armstrong and Paul Whiteman.

In conventional jazz histories, Armstrong and Whiteman are presented as opposites, Armstrong representing authentic and innovative jazz with Whiteman seen as a someone who made millions by presenting a watered down, counterfeit version of the music to the white public. Barrett sees this view as a distortion inherited from Popular Front socialism and the modern civil rights movement. Instead, he contends, the two men are “twin fathers of American popular music,” whose relationship is one of “overlap and reciprocity” (196, xii).

Berrett tries to link the two musicians in every conceivable way, often rather tenuously, as when he connects a Whiteman poster advertising him as “The Mussolini of the Ragtime World” with Armstrong’s statement six years later when he visited Italy that he enjoyed “seeing his own picture blown up to the same size as Mussolini” (102). However, Berrett’s main thesis is that both Whiteman and Armstrong blurred the boundaries between black and white music by incorporating elements of the African American and European traditions, respectively. Whiteman helped (but did not hire) black musicians, used African American arrangers, played “hot” music, and earned praise from the black press and bandleaders like Duke Ellington. Similarly, Armstrong employed white sidemen, quoted from operas and light classics, and incorporated relatively advanced European harmonies into his compositions. Berrett also argues that the two men drew on both popular culture and “high” culture, blurring that boundary as well. Both sought to entertain above all else and saw jazz as “inclusive,” encompassing “middlebrow” pop music and light classics.

Louis Armstrong and Paul Whiteman raises important questions about jazz, race, and American culture, but unfortunately does not explore them in the depth that they deserve. Berrett states his theses in the most general terms, evading the difficult issues. What does it mean to say that jazz is “inclusive”? Should a musical performance incorporating any element of jazz, no matter how superficially, properly be called jazz? What is at stake in having an “inclusive” or “non-inclusive” definition of jazz? When does a celebration of “inclusiveness” become an uncritical stance toward popular culture? Also, what does it mean to blur racial boundaries? Does earning praise from African Americans make one’s music more “black”? What influence did race and racial politics have on musicians and their music? In the end, one is left to ponder incidents like...
Whiteman’s statement to African American bandleader Fletcher Henderson that if he were a white man, he would be a millionaire, without learning much about its significance.

Charles Hersch


In the fall of 1934 a massive strike wave engulfed the textile industry. The rapid spread of the conflict through isolated mill villages, and the militancy of previously docile Southern workers surprised industry observers. Sociologists Vincent J. Roscigno and William F. Danaher turn to radio and music to help explain what led 400,000 workers to join almost spontaneously in one of the largest labor conflicts in American history. As the authors observe, mounting grievances, especially the stretch-out, which increased the pace and intensity of work, were major motivating forces. But many of these grievances were not unique. What had changed was the emergence of a new form of communication, radio, which provided a venue for musicians performing oppositional mill music and a voice for speakers critical of the industrial status quo. They argue that music should be viewed as a “form of discourse through which collective identity is fostered and movement solidarity is achieved (xxiv). Radio served as a tool for the diffusion of this new identity, enabling information to flow between communities. Indeed strike participation in 1934 was more likely in mill towns with radio stations. Together, music and radio built the sense of collective identity and oppositional consciousness that were crucial to the great uprising.

Through formal and informal mechanisms, including company-owned houses, schools, and churches, paternalist mill owners traditionally controlled virtually every aspect of their workers’ lives. Music, however, provided a free space, which enabled mill workers to articulate their grievances and to envision collective solutions. Musicians, many current or former mill workers, through singing songs about mill life helped raise workers’ consciousness and fostered a new group identity. By performing throughout the textile belt they helped build connections between mill villages. In the midst of the textile strikes, songs served as protest tools during parades and on picket lines, helping to build solidarity.

Radio, which became an increasing integral part of American life in the twenties and early thirties, was equally important in creating an oppositional culture. Roscigno and Danaher contend that this was a unique period for radio. Because reformers and commercial interests were fighting for control of the airwaves, radio remained relatively accessible to diverse interests, including workers. Radio gave mill musicians a new platform and helped create a new audience for their music. It also gave mill workers new political perceptions of their rights, particularly the right to collectively protest. In a series of nationally-broadcast speeches, President Franklin Roosevelt paid special attention to the plight of mill workers, which helped legitimize their claims of injustice and gave them the belief that the power of the federal government was on their side. During the 1934 strike, radio enabled union leaders to speak directly to workers, enabling organized labor to more effectively mobilize strikers. Thus radio “culturally and politically linked these workers to one another as never before” (p. 119). The authors make an important contribution to the growing literature on radio and social movements, shedding new light on the significance of radio in the resurgence of worker militancy in
the early thirties. However labor’s voice on radio was no transitory phenomena for as late as the 1950s, unions and workers had a significant voice in the media.

West Virginia University

Elizabeth Fones-Wolf


Michael Augspurger’s book covers much more than its subtitle suggests. It fits into an emerging scholarship on liberalism and consumerism, as well as more longstanding debates about Popular Front culture and the professionalization of the intellectual. Fortune, created by Henry Luce for a wealthy business-connected audience, rarely figures into discussions of the literary People’s Front because most scholars assume it was a bastion of corporate capitalism. Augspurger renames this assumption, suggesting that its staff actually modeled an “affirmative identity” for artists different from the “adversary identity” symbolized by the New York intellectuals (p. 17). This identity dovetailed with the Popular Front artistic mentality, albeit more conservatively, because its advocates believed in planning, democracy, and artistic realism. Yet this identity faded after World War II and the more adversarial “art for art’s sake” “highbrow” artist best represented by William Phillips and Philip Rahv’s Partisan Review triumphed.

Augspurger is at his best when dealing with these larger categories and trends. That is not to say that the details of Fortune’s artistic disputes and the quirky personalities of its many staff writers, including Dwight Macdonald, James Agee and Archibald MacLeish, are not interesting; but the more synthetic, interpretive ideas will engage a broader range of scholars. The Fortune experience allows Augspurger to talk about the relationship between the artist and the culture. Early on, Fortune’s cultural producers cultivated an informed business professional readership, so featured the work of artists excited by the industrial process, a sort of socialist realism for the elite. By the late Thirties, Fortune’s style was less elite as the corporate liberalism it espoused was “in crisis” (p. 93). During the Popular Front period, it embraced an authentic American style emerging from the heartland, one consistent with the Federal Arts projects and the People’s Culture about which Michael Denning has written (The Cultural Front, London: Verso, 1996). Fortune echoed New Deal and leftist artists’ valuing of everyday themes and folk cultural idioms. For Front intellectual, this meant embedding the creative process in the milieu of “the people;” but for Fortune’s writers it remained connected to the production process, industry and capitalism.

The story should sound familiar, but its emphasis is not. While Augspurger narrates the traditional political reasons why post-war anti-communism blunted the engaged, affirmative artistic ideal and lent authority to its adversarial alternative, he is primarily interested in the personal consequences of the change. Circumstances forced intellectuals to become professionals. They entered academe, assimilating its rules and practices. In a culture dominated by conformity, they became obsessed with expressing their own uniqueness. They lost interest in educating the public and came to identify the folk they once admired as “middlebrow.” Fortune’s artistic and literary departments shrank and the business of American society—and the magazine itself—went back to being business. New York intellectuals, not New Deal ones, provided counterpoint.

Augspurger’s book is a stimulating read for anyone interested in twentieth century intellectuals.

St. Olaf College

Judy Kutulas

Home figures prominently in many studies of American literature, culture, and character. For example, Eric Sundquist's *Home as Found: Authority and Genealogy in Nineteenth-Century American Literature* (1977) uses the concept and symbol of home as a key for understanding such classic writers as Herman Melville. It is a tribute to the brilliance and ingenuity of Elisabeth Bronfen that she takes this familiar territory, explores it again in the different medium of film, and through a coherent and cohesive synthesis of psychoanalytical, ideological, and cultural modes of criticism constructs an illuminating and original analysis and understanding of a broad range of classic and contemporary films, including Alfred Hitchcock's *Rebecca* (1940), John Ford's *The Searchers* (1956), John Sayles *Lone Star* (1996), Douglas Sirk's *Imitation of Life* (1959), and David Fincher's *Seven* (1995), among others. She succinctly and persuasively explains her purpose and method at the beginning of the work as an examination of "different configurations of psychic dislocation as it becomes embedded with situations of exile and displacement, regardless of whether home refers to an imaginary place of belonging, to a concrete house that affords protection and comfort, or to a particular geocultural community" (22). In the chapters that follow, Bronfen's persuasive synthesis of modernist thinkers such as Hegel, Heidegger, and Freud with the postmodernism of Michel Foucault and others finds its own intellectual and critical home in her astute mastery of film language and technique. Thus, her original insights into the operation of the "unheimlich" or the uncanny in the films evolves into a compelling argument about the films as examples of "what Michel Foucault calls heterotopic sites, countersites to everyday localities" (97). This use of the heterotopic site as a way of viewing and analyzing the films becomes especially original and inventive in her blending of readings of *The Searchers* and *Lone Star* in two convincing chapters on each of the films. Like others, in previous books, I have analyzed these films as part of a common cultural and historic context. Bronfen advances such studies through an integrative perspective of the films "by crossmapping" them. She argues, that "John Sayles directly addresses the issue that though in the course of the alleged civilization of the West, the simple contradiction between a hostile wilderness and the provisional homes of the settlers may have been successfully resolved" by being "replaced by a new point of contention—the debate about how cultural hybridity, introduced into individual families and homes in such a manner that it cannot be eradicated, can be put to productive use for a community in general" (128). Concerning these films and their importance to our understanding of the history and significance of Hollywood’s representation of the West, Bronfen argues compellingly that "one might claim that in the late-twentieth century Texas depicted by Sayles, a synthesis has been effected between the homely hearth and the uncanny prairie" (128). In terms of subject matter and critical methodology, *Home in Hollywood* is a significant achievement.

Vanderbilt University

Sam B. Girgus


Brian Masaru Hayashi's *Democratizing the Enemy* extends the internationalizing work of recent scholarship on Japanese Americans' wartime incarceration, offering new insights drawn from largely neglected records. In a detailed elaboration of the effect of
Japanese Americans’ relationship with Japan on their life in camp, Hayashi shows that internees felt far more than a clash of loyalties. While the Japanese government indirectly sent propagandistic reassurances, the camps’ internal governance often depended on internees’ previous contacts with Japan. Among internees, kibei—who had spent time in Japan for education—were usually the most feared and distrusted. And late in the war internees sought a place at postwar peace negotiations between Japan and the United States.

Even more impressive is Hayashi’s discussion of domestic issues. Autobiographies and histories typically describe the camps’ locations as desert wastelands chosen for their remoteness, but Hayashi examines wrangling between government and local residents that most internees were probably unaware of. General John De Witt ordered a camp built on a portion of Colorado River Indian Tribes reservation land, oblivious to a dispute between the tribes and the Office of Indian Affairs over water rights. Farmers, merchants, and bureaucrats in California’s Owens Valley protested the drain on their scant resources forced by the Manzanar camp. After the war, neighbors of the Topaz camp in the Utah desert received almost none of the camp’s assets, not even the water system, which was sold “at a forty percent discount” to Farmington, New Mexico (208).

Democratizing the Enemy also offers valuable small perceptions for future study. One is the observation of the influence, especially during early camp life, of class differences on internal governance. In Tanforan, for example, leaders were often “professional elites with little understanding of how average Japanese Americans lived prior to internment” (95). And Hayashi carefully distinguishes the often clashing views of internees held by military officials, government bureaucrats, and social scientists.

Yet the book needs to be supplemented by some of the very works Hayashi rejects for what he perceives to be their narrowness. His most serious error is his relative neglect of racism. While most studies accept the standard attributions of racism and wartime hysteria as principal causes of the incarceration, Hayashi subverts the idea of social constructedness by mistakenly subsuming racism to race. He dismisses racism’s causal significance by misreading Ethnic Studies scholarship arguing that race is fluid and contingent. Few would agree with his claim that the “nineteenth-century Yellow Peril racial idea, revived by wartime hysteria, and ‘causing’ the concentration camps, seems outdated even if certain elements persist” (7). Race may be fluid and contingent, but racism is not. Also, Hayashi condemns scholars for focusing so narrowly on “domestic” issues such as racism and narratives of accommodation and resistance that they miss “global dimensions” of the incarceration (217). Yet some of the works that internationalize Japanese America also insist on racism as a central explanation. John Dower’s War Without Mercy and Gerald Horne’s recent Race War are necessary correctives to Hayashi’s argument.

To claim that Hayashi’s book needs to be supplemented by other studies is not, however, to condemn it. In fact, the mass and value of its information make Democratizing the Enemy itself a necessary supplement to previous histories.

Washington State University

John Streamas


Thomas Doherty’s deftly argued, passionately researched, superbly written analysis of the link between the rise of American television and the fall of Senator Joseph R.
McCarthy is hampered solely by a problematic premise. The problem is not the assertion that TV’s imbrication with McCarthyism was complex, that the cool medium collided as much as colluded with the Cold War. This point is well taken, as it has been by a coterie of television scholars and for quite some time. The problem is that Doherty claims that his view is news, that it counters the conventional wisdom. He even enlists TV scholar David Marc, in an endnote, as a rare “fellow dissenter” on the matter. Here Doherty’s otherwise assiduous research fails him. While a neo-Frankfurt school view of TV as a handmaiden of corporate capitalism still holds its own in television studies, a Gramscian cultural studies camp has long encouraged a more nuanced take on television’s impact on culture and society in general, and 1950s American television in particular (see Michele Hilmes, Nina Leibman, Denise Mann, Lynn Spigel, et al.)

Doherty seems to sense the flimsiness of his argument, for the remainder of his text is only cursorily devoted to supporting it. Cold War, Cool Medium is not—thankfully, in this instance—a thesis-driven work. It is, however, a provocative application of McLuhanism to McCarthyism, as well as a probing analysis of the ascending and descending arcs of the “fellow travelers in American history” (260): TV and McCarthy. While giving Edward R. Morrow’s famed See It Now expose and the Army-McCarthy hearings their due in the dethroning of “Tail Gunner Joe,” Doherty emphasizes how the red-baiting bully was already primed for the kill by his alienation of the Eisenhower administration and the mainstream press. The hearings, however, dealt the death blow, as “the hot personality [McCarthy] melted under the glare of television and the cool one [opposing attorney Joseph Welsh] never broke a sweat” (190).

While centered on McCarthy, Doherty’s study is not focused exclusively on him. The blacklist in the entertainment industry provides an illuminating backdrop, as do richly documented and colorfully narrated sidebars on the Philip Loeb and Lucille Ball cases: “while the small fry were hooked and gutted, the big fish would be tossed back” (59). Especially welcome is Doherty’s extensive examination of the too often historically overlooked though contemporaneously overt cultural and constitutional link between anti-Communism and homophobia—”constitutional” by virtue of governmental hiring discrimination based on homosexuals’ purported security risk (an irony not lost on McCarthy’s foes in regard to the suspected gayness of the senator’s chief assistant, Roy Cohn).

Doherty, who in earlier contributions to film scholarship—Pre-Code Hollywood: Sex, Immorality, and Insurrection in American Cinema, 1930-1934 (1999) and Projections of War: Hollywood, American Culture, and World War II (1993)—sought to foster a more favorable view of U.S. cinema than has been the vogue in academe, here seeks to provide a similar rehabilitative service for American television. While the service, as I have indicated, is redundant, the overall result is well worth the effort.

USC Annenberg School for Communication

Vincent Brook


This book examines the FBI’s surveillance of activist, socially progressive (i.e., liberal and leftist anthropologists) in mid-20th-century America. Anthropologist David Price has discovered that the FBI compiled secret files on hundreds of anthropologists, a startling fact since the entire discipline was not much larger. Using a wide range of
case studies focused on the experiences of some two-dozen scholars, Price emphasizes the damage done to activist anthropologists and their progressive agendas. Here, we see academic freedom undermined, scholarly careers compromised, institutions of higher education warped, private lives degraded, and critical frameworks of investigation discouraged.

Unfortunately, for anthropologists accused of un-American activities and thought crimes, the American Anthropological Association offered little support. According to Price, instead of defending accused anthropologists who needed and deserved help, the AAA “buried its head in the sand, ignoring anthropologists being fired, blacklisted, and taught the valuable lessons of self-censorship.”(69) Here, Price joins authors like Ellen Schrecker and Jessica Wang who have found that during the McCarthy Era, American universities and professional scholarly societies were unable or unwilling to mount a strong defense of academic freedom. Activist anthropologists like those from other disciplines thus had to fend for themselves and were easily marginalized. As a justification, many anthropologists stated that a scholarly society like the AAA should not get involved in politics, in order to maintain its professional authority. Price forcefully argues, however, that this stance was hypocritical because at the very same time, the AAA was cooperating at many levels with the rapidly growing national security state. Some anthropologists like Yale’s George P. Murdock even became FBI informers.

In this depressing story, some activist anthropologists were Communists and Socialists, while others were liberals and anti-communists. But whatever their political affiliation, Price finds that they were working for good causes, by challenging American racism, questioning the development of nuclear weapons, and attacking Western colonialism. Moreover, they were not the puppets of a foreign conspiracy based in Moscow. Whatever their party affiliation, these anthropologists shared a commitment to the inherent worth and equality of the various peoples and cultures. Sadly, J. Edgar Hoover’s FBI seriously undermined their efforts to make the U.S. and the world a better place. This is a story of American anthropologists losing their way, being diverted from what Price claims is their “natural, and ethically required, activist roles.”(xiii)

Clearly organized and written, though at times repetitive and with too many extended quotations, Price’s study rests on extensive research in primary sources including government records obtained through the Freedom of Information Act. Threatening Anthropology joins a long list of works that critically examine the ways in which the nation state monitored, investigated, and intimidated a wide array of groups—actors, teachers, sociologists, physicists, organized labor, etc.—during the McCarthy era (and beyond). In the current national climate, we can use all the guidance we can get from such detailed historical research.

Harvard University

Mark Solovey


Nearly fifty years after “Howl”(1956), “On the Road” (1957), and “Naked Lunch” (1959) altered the course of American literature, Beat authors continue to be both lionized and malign in popular biographies, autobiographies and memoirs. But as Jennie Skerl observes in her Introduction to “Reconstructing the Beats,” a collection of thirteen thought-provoking essays, “scholarly assessments are still in short supply” (1). Americans would apparently rather be entertained by anecdotes about the Beat Generation authors than grant them serious study.
"Reconstructing the Beats" diverts attention away from the Beat luminaries—Ginsberg, Kerouac and Burroughs—and focuses instead on largely ignored women and African-Americans who took up the Beat banner of experimentation and non-conformity and carried it into the counterculture of the 1960s. Nancy M. Grace explores the mix of modernism and post-modernism in the work of ruth weiss, who, like e.e. cummings, never capitalized her name. Amy L. Friedman discusses the obstacles that Joanne Kyger encountered in the patriarchal Beat pantheon, and yet still managed to expressed her unique experience as a woman. A. Robert Lee offers a stunning portrait of the life and the work of Ted Joans and makes a convincing case for his bold originality. With carefully selected examples from Joans's work, Lee captures the essential joy in his poetry. He also reminds us that African-American writers borrowed from white writers. The literary and cultural influences cut back and forth across racial lines.

Though Ginsberg, Kerouac and Burroughs take a back seat in this volume, they are not entirely forgotten. Richard Quinn tackles the hotly contested debate about how much or how little Kerouac understood jazz—though he doesn’t resolve it. Tony Trigilia explores the controversial role of Buddhism in Ginsberg’s late poetry, and Oliver Harris interprets William Burroughs’s appearance as a fictional character in Kerouac’s novels—and thereby sheds much needed light on the Beat habit of mythologizing one another as well as themselves.

The approach is interdisciplinary and cross-cultural and there are essays about the Beats and Mexican magical realism, and the Beats and American abstract expressionism. All of the thirteen scholars represented in Skerl’s volume emphasize paradoxes, ambiguities, and contradictions. Instead of cliches, contradictions come to the fore. Reconstruction is the keynote, as the title makes clear. Even the iconic Beatnik in black beret and black turtleneck, a figure much maligned, takes on new reconstructed dignity as a genuine participant in the making of the Beat Generation.

The much misunderstood role of spontaneity and improvisation comes up in several essays. In theory, the Beat authors were all for uninhibited writing. In fact, they habitually revised their work. “Reconstructing the Beats” will hopefully encourage more scholarship about the literary craftsmanship of Ginsberg, Kerouac, Burroughs and their circle. Skerl’s collection will also hopefully inspire students and teachers to read, or to reread as the case may be, the seriously playful poetry of Ted Joans. A. Robert Lee’s essay is the perfect introduction to an author who cries out for recognition and appreciation. With many of Joans’s papers now at the Bancroft Library in Berkeley, a comprehensive biography practically begs to be written.

Sonoma State University


When many of us think of the civil rights movements of the late 1950s and 1960s, what comes to mind are emotionally charged TV images of state troopers firing tear gas at peaceful demonstrations or snarling police dogs and fire hoses turned loose on defenseless protesters. As important, powerful, and realistic as these media depictions were, they have overshadowed the contributions of other media to the civil rights movement and protests, particular those of Southern black-oriented radio. In his study *Radio and the Struggle for Civil Rights in the South*, Brian Ward sets out to correct this imbalance. As he highlights, “radio warrants a prominent place among the many social
and cultural institutions that shaped the African American freedom struggle and fashioned important changes in racial attitudes and arrangements in the South.” (358) In fact, his goal is much more ambitious than just highlighting radio’s interaction with the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s: he surveys radio’s contributions from the 1930s through the 1970s, adding important layers to our understanding of the struggle for black civil rights in the American South over the course of half a century.

Ward’s book is divided into three parts which dovetails with the traditional narrative of the civil rights movement. Part 1 focuses on the era before the mass marches (1930s through the early 1950s) and emphasizes radio’s role as “a highly politicized vehicle for survival and resistance.” (110) The second part details the participation of local broadcasting during the height of the civil rights protests told through six specific case studies; not surprisingly, this is the longest section of the study. A shorter closing part, finally, investigates the period after 1965 and highlights the significant impact of black power on the battles over radio ownership and content.

In all of these sections it is important to stress that Ward deals with “black-oriented radio,” a term which encompasses all radio broadcasting directed at primarily black or racially mixed audiences with significant African American segments in the South. The vast majority of these radio stations were owned and operated by white owners. Black-owned radio stations were a miniscule proportion of all radio outlets in the South—only one existed by 1949 and fewer than a dozen by 1969. Even by the end of the 1970s, though the number had increased significantly to 140, black-owned radio stations represented less than 2% of the total number of stations operated in the U.S. While this trend in general represented a significant improvement and increased black activism over the air, Ward points out that black-owned and black-managed radio outlets did not always “demonstrate any greater commitment to public service broadcasting or community activism than did their white-run counterparts.” (283)

As the author emphasizes throughout his nuanced discussion, black-oriented radio, like its white-oriented counterpart, consisted primarily of entertainment. Yet it significantly assisted in maintaining a sense of black unity and pride as well as a sense of purpose. Especially prior to the 1950s radio stations focusing on black communities and social activism were forced to walk a perilous tightrope, and even the most courageous stations like WERD-Atlanta and WGIV-Charlotte became at best “tentative sites of interracialism” (359) forced combat to both commercial and social pressures. By the late 1950s and 1960s, a number of black-oriented stations moved beyond the “Bible and blues” format of the earlier decades and actively supported the civil rights marches as much as possible, in some instances actively coordinating specific marches through coded messages, as in the case of WENN-Birmingham in the spring of 1963. It was not until climate change of the late 1960s and after activists put pressure on the FCC that many black-oriented radio stations were finally at liberty to give their deejahs freer reign to voice activist editorials and to actively participate in community mobilization. As Ward concludes, “attention to black political, social and economic issues was never greater on southern radio” than in the late 1960s and the 1970s. (361)

Radio and the Struggle for Civil Rights in the South is an important contribution to the study of radio broadcasting and the civil rights movement. The scope of the study and the depth of the research are truly impressive. Ward’s study deserves a broad audience and should appeal to both scholars and general audiences.

Concordia University

Gerd Horten
Television has never received much attention within American Studies, which is odd considering its cultural importance. Part of the problem in the past is that media studies scholarship has tended to be either theoretically too specific or too narrowly focused on industrial concerns. In recent years, however, television scholarship has been dominated by interdisciplinary cultural studies traditions and the best of such scholarship, like the recent Television Studies Reader (Routledge), addresses industrial, textual, and audience concerns in ways that are historically grounded and eminently readable. The anthology of essays Quality Popular Television is the best of a number of recent collections published by the British Film Institute.

Quality Popular Television focuses on “transformations in contemporary television culture,” specifically the way in which the post-network era networks abandoned the focus on mass audiences and sought to attract the most valuable audiences, generally identified here as white, affluent, educated, urban middle classes. As QPT’s British academic editors Jancovich and Lyons point out, this “niche” audience was international as well as national. The essays offer useful discussions of the worldwide popularity of American television programs (and their Anglo counterparts), the cultural values these programs carry with them, and their influence on the development of television programming in other countries, Europe and Australia in particular. The mix of authors represented here—primarily American, British and Australian—attest to the globalization of television studies as an industry and an academic field, offering an important transnational perspective on American culture.

QPT is separated into three sections which focus on industrial changes, textual analyses, and audiences, respectively. The text section contains two of the best analyses of the cultural work of television texts: Anna McCarthy’s “‘Must See’ Queer TV: History and Serial Form in Ellen” and Lisa Parks’ “Brave New Buffy: Rethinking TV Violence.” While the “niche” audiences of the 90s were generally liberal, McCarthy’s essay argues that the difficulties Ellen faced in attempting to address the everyday life of an out lesbian character during the show’s final season suggests both the limitations of television’s “liberal narrative” and its role in the broader social struggles of gays and lesbians in the 1990s. Parks’ essay suggests the cultural significance of Buffy the Vampire Slayer by analyzing its representations of teen violence within the context of the Columbine shootings. Parks argues that rather than exacerbating teen violence, as critics accused it of doing in Columbine’s wake, Buffy “is exactly the kind of TV violence that parents and teens need to see” because it “complicates the meanings of TV violence.” Parks and McCarthy’s very accessible essays are especially well suited for non-media classes, where discussion of queer or adolescent lives in America could be usefully enhanced by attention to television.

The limitations of QPT are those of many such anthologies: television programming changes so quickly that published anthologies invariably seem out of date. QPT is very specific to the latter half of the 1990s and does not, therefore, address the way in which reality television has done so much to change the television landscape in the last several years. But this collection captures its cultural moment well, offering a great deal to both cultural historians and television scholars.

DePaul University

Allison McCracken

Sidney Poitier is an icon of the American cinema. In African-American film history there is arguably no individual who looms larger than this accomplished actor. Since the late 1960's, Poitier has also been a much-maligned figure, considered responsible for asexual, unmanly Uncle Tom performances. Much of this criticism has been ahistorical, based upon shoddy premises and simply illegitimate. Unfortunately, Aram Goudsouzian’s Sidney Poitier: Man, Actor, Icon continues this tradition, besmirching the actor’s character and critiquing his films in a fashion in which no role would be deemed to be politically or racially appropriate. This is of weighty importance since Goudsouzian’s biography is the first substantial one to emerge since Poitier’s autobiographies, This Life (1980) and The Measure of a Man (2000).

This is not to acknowledge that Goudsouzian is not a fine historian. This is a meticulously researched volume that provides tremendous insight into the personal and professional complications that Poitier faced in his career. What is problematic is Goudsouzian’s interpretation, particularly his dissection of Poitier’s body of work. In the author’s view, every film of Poitier’s is flawed in some substantial way. To Sir With Love (1967) has “cotton candy sweetness” and the actor is a “passionless monument to self-control (262-263).” In The Defiant Ones (1957), Poitier’s performance is “powerful” but then the film is dismissed because it “exhibited the perspective of white liberals (156-157).” Astonishingly, even Poitier’s performance in the Lorraine Hansberry-penned A Raisin in the Sun is critiqued because of its “universality” and because it “looked like a photographed stage production (187).” And these were the critiques of Poitier’s “better” films.

It is this framework of interpretation that complicates the author’s narrative. While he does a magnificent job of establishing the conditions that led to the production of Poitier’s films, the on-set complications and the reaction by the popular press, the author fails to acknowledge the symbolic and moral importance of each of these screen roles for the African-American community. Oprah Winfrey has recounted countless times the significance of Poitier’s Oscar win in 1964 to her sense of self-worth and of future achievement. Poitier’s iconic status in the 1950’s and early 1960’s reached the point of idealization; perhaps it was inevitable that his fall from grace would occur in the turbulent late 1960’s with the Black Power movement. The actor’s personal life is also burnished in this volume; at times he appears as an indifferent parent and then a patriarchal monster, and also a cruel and indifferent lover to Diahann Carroll. It is to Goudsouzian’s credit that he paints a portrait of a complicated man who was attempting to negotiate his personal and professional life through unprecedented success, ever changing political and racial sensibilities and the manipulations of weasel-like studio heads. The author places Poitier’s creative and personal decisions in the context of the times in which he was living. But to call the actor a “ghost” who is “consecrated as a heroic pioneer” and a “stereotype” is to demean the difficult challenges he faced in a rapidly changing society (380).

Aurora University

Gerald R. Butters Jr.

This book, conceived during a British conference in 1999 to mark the 30th anniversary of the festival, considers how and why the officially titled Woodstock Aquarian Music and Arts Fair of August 1969 attained its iconic status as a key cultural ‘moment’ of the late 1960s. The nine chapters by established and new writers in the fields of sociology, media studies and popular music studies explore specific aspects of the Woodstock festival and its continuing significance in relation to the music industry, the evolution of international pop (including rock, folk and ‘world music’) festivals, the development of rock music in the wake of Woodstock, and the growth of 1960s nostalgia—including a rather poignant coda on the subsequent effect on his career by the veteran performer and anti-Vietnam war activist Country Joe McDonald.

As the volume’s editor notes in his introduction, the Woodstock festival has acquired a legendary status ‘as both the defining and the last great moment of the 1960s’ (xiv). In stark contrast to its nemesis, the nightmarish, negative and murderous Altamont Festival held on the West Coast later in 1969, Woodstock appeared to represent many of the most optimistic elements of that turbulent decade. For many it continues to represent the point at which the most positive creative and political energies of the 1960s counterculture united briefly in a spectacle of ‘peace, love and music’ seeming to synergize the ‘anti-war, anti-establishment, pro-drug, non-competitive and individualistic’ (xiv) lifestyles which had been growing in popularity throughout the western world, and particularly in the United States, throughout the 1960s.

Chapters examine various aspects of the Woodstock Festival, both in terms of its role and the place in the history of post-Second World War popular culture and from the perspective of its continuing hold on the imagination of those who look back, often wistfully, to the 1960s. Different sections include an examination of the ways in which lessons learned about the successes and failures of the original festival helped turn pop festivals into highly lucrative concerns—as evidenced by the 25th and 30th anniversary Woodstock Festivals of 1994 and 1999, or by the British Glastonbury and internationally successful WOMAD Festivals.

A particularly impressive aspect of this volume are chapters by Shelia Whiteley and Dave Allen which respectively analyze key musical moments of the Woodstock festival in terms of their particular countercultural messages and examine the way in which Woodstock marked a transitional stage in the history of North American popular music between rurally-oriented, acoustic folk forms rooted in the sounds of what Griel Marcus once termed ‘old weird America’ and the heavily amplified commercially oriented rock music of the second half of the decade. A good example of the former is Country Joe McDonald’s iconic ‘I-Feel-Like-I’m-Fixing-To-Die-Rag’, while an equally iconic example of the latter is the tortured, feedback-drenched rendition of ‘The Star Spangled Banner’ with which Jimi Hendrix closed the festival.

Performed almost a day behind schedule amidst a sea of mud and garbage to an exhausted, utterly stoned and overwhelmingly white audience, few performances seem to capture the ironies and febrile cultural climate of the late 1960s so perfectly. However, as Whiteley perceptively points out, Hendrix’s wonderful performance was no spontaneous gesture and was born directly out of his intimate understanding of the bitter ironies facing black servicemen in Vietnam. Its ‘onomatopoetic evocation of the sounds of jungle warfare’ (25), dive bomber fretboard runs and screaming, echoing...
wah-wah howls were both measured and deeply political and were, as Whiteley (quoting Charles Shaar Murray) points out; 'performed by a black man with a white guitar to a massive almost completely white audience in a paddy field of its own making' (25).

Richmond, The American International University in London


“The 1970’s may be our strangest decade,” the editors speculate in their introduction (p. 1); and such a claim might encourage reviewers to give this anthology of nine essays a bit of slack. To be sure, no obvious theme or problem ties the disparate threads of this decade—or any book about it—together: no Jazz Age jitters, no Depression despair, no shock to the system that marked the Sixties (to which David Farber in particular has so expertly addressed himself). A decade that began in the turmoil of the Vietnam War and ended with the political axis shifting to the right with the election of Ronald Reagan resists the easy summation of the political historians, especially when they have to consider the astonishing Watergate scandal and then the brief administrations of Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter. That decade consolidated the gains of the civil rights movement, the feminist movement and the gay rights movement—and yet was punctuated by a resounding military defeat when Saigon became Ho Chi Minh City and by a hostage crisis that frustrated and enraged patriotic Americans. This represented too ambiguous and cluttered a legacy for the scholar of public culture to diagnose with assurance. Bailey and Farber thus go where angels might fear to tread. Their book nevertheless includes useful essays on race (by Eric Porter), on gender (by Bailey herself), and on class (by Jefferson Cowie). “Adults Only” should also be singled out for praise. Peter Braunstein’s account of New York City’s sexual bacchanalia demonstrates how far the logic could go of legitimating sexual pleasure that began with the marketing of the birth-control pill in 1960.

But if a reviewer must also be a kibitzer, the inadequacies of America in the Seventies deserve also to be mentioned. Perhaps because the best-seller of the decade was an apocalyptic fantasy inspired by Biblical prophecy, Hal Lindsey’s The Late, Great Planet Earth (1970), William Graebner is allowed to devote an entire essay to a disaster film. But The Poseidon Adventure (1972) did not change the movie industry. Only three years later Jaws drove Americans away from beaches and into the habit of standing in line for blockbusters. Wouldn’t Steven Spielberg’s far more influential film have been a worthier choice? From the perspective of the new century, the decade’s most ominous episode in international affairs—the rough equivalent of an archduke’s assassination in 1914—was the fall of the Shah of Iran. Yet Farber mentions only in passing the geopolitical confrontation with “the Great Satan” that an aggrieved Islamic republic inaugurated in 1979. Retrospective judgment can also discern in domestic politics the pre-1980 origins of the counter-revolution against the Sixties. In 1960 the Democratic nominee insisted that his Roman Catholicism would not affect his performance as President. But in 1976 the Democratic nominee asserted the contrary, and asked voters to take into account his piety as a Southern Baptist. This challenge to the secular sensibility would gain momentum thereafter, and thus should be deemed more consequential than an essay on, say, skateboarding in southern California.

Brandeis University

Stephen J. Whitfield
Mark Rice introduces us to a compendious array of images from the 1970s, the Photographic Surveys administered by the National Endowment for the Arts. He argues that these collections show debates over the aesthetics, politics, and practices of photography and document the shifting urban terrain in which so many of these surveys operated. At the Bicentennial moment the Federal government gave attention to creating a past for future viewers by documenting the present. During Senate hearings Walter Mondale evoked the social purposes that were the foundation of the 1930's Farm Security Administration and the resulting NEA initiative self-consciously gestured to the FSA's work in portraying the nation through photographs.

Through the Lens is well-structured to give a coherent interpretation of a massive amount of material. Rice devises a scale of artistic intent and critical reception ranging from photography as art to photography as social documentation. He weaves together textual and visual themes drawn from projects across the country—Atlanta, Baltimore, Galveston, Saint Louis, and San Francisco, for example. Finally, he shows how his themes and critical perspectives work in four surveys of one urban location—Los Angeles. To the text Rice appends a very useful, annotated list of all the photographic surveys: 72 entries over the period 1974-1981. For scholars interested in depictions of the urban scene during the 1970s Rice’s work is an important resource.

I especially appreciated the attention that Rice devoted to the construction of the Photographic Surveys program. His account reminds us that once the Federal government, for all its indulgences in kitsch, did support a public culture. The qualities of this culture were particularly contested as the bicentennial came and went, and Rice’s account of how these tensions played out in the public realm should add to our understanding of the role of American Studies in that domain, and, indeed, the ways in which the dynamics of public debate mirror developments within American Studies practice.

Rice’s sphere of allusions do not match the immense scope of this photographic archive. This book concentrates on representations of the city in the 1970s. The social environments in which these images were produced are discussed, but policy debates—in many ways completing the public sphere in which the Photographic Survey operated—are mostly unmentioned. There is no reference to the documentary efforts of the Historic American Buildings Survey, a large, Federally-sponsored archive of images that would have challenged the celebratory photographs of urban renewal in Atlanta. Individual photographs carry their own sets of references. Martin Stupich’s “Five Belongs to the New Atlanta” screams for a reference to Charles Demuth or William Carlos Williams. The overall discussion of postmodernism could have worked beyond overused terms such as “contingent” and “nostalgic.” Examples from the visual realm could have supplanted the puzzlingly distracting analysis of Lurie’s The Nowhere City, which acts as a preamble to the Los Angeles chapter.

Overall, though, this is an impressive work both for what it says and for the material it introduces.

University of Wyoming Eric Sandeen
Both of these books make contributions to our understanding of the emergence of conservative evangelicalism in American life. They both project this phenomenon onto American culture and arrive at strikingly similar conclusions regarding the influence of evangelical religion in American culture and politics.

Barry Hankins explores the Southern Baptist Convention and the battle between conservatives and moderates for supremacy within it during the 1980s. Hankins argues that the controversy stemmed from a dispute over power and place. “Conservatives were able to win the Southern Baptist Controversy by tapping into basic conservative instincts that existed among rank-and-file Southern Baptists who did not identify with their moderate leaders.” (9) The chief issue in this fight for control was not theology, although conservatives did stress the “inerrancy” of the Bible (what is popularly called fundamentalism, although conservatives within the SBC eschewed this label) but culture. In this sense, the fight for denominational control within the SBC reflected wider social and cultural fights over abortion, women’s rights and even race.

Hankins explores each of these concerns, being careful to delineate that what at one time was a southern phenomenon was seeking recruits and allies outside the South. Even southern culture represented Babylon to the conservatives within the SBC and the fight over culture was representative of their efforts at restoration. Hankins is careful to argue that while there was a connection between the SBC and conservative organizations organizing among religious faiths in the 1970s and 1980s, the SBC was primarily its own player, stressing accommodation on church-state issues, for instance, while other New Right organizations stressed strict separation and some conservative faiths emphasized a return to old Testament law.

Hankins deals with such issues with dispassion. His easy writing style rewards a reader interested in understanding the diversity within modern American evangelicalism. Too often academics reduce all conservative expressions among religious groups to the useless term Religious Right. Hankins shows why this should not be the case.

Heather Hendershot’s book, while academic and scholarly in its approach, is an entertaining examination of evangelical culture in contemporary America. She explores topics ranging from selling Jesus as a commodity through T-shirts to cartoons (such as the very popular Veggie Tales series) to movies (such as Omega Code) to rock music. Evangelical culture has been mainstreamed, Hendershot argues, to such a degree that it is difficult to tell at times whether the message is evangelical. “Evangelicals have used media to simultaneously struggle against, engage with, and acquiesce to the secular world.” (11) And while evangelical media rarely converts or influences any outside the fold, they still “hope to turn people onto the Gospel message.” (214)

One of the more interesting chapters in Hendershot’s book is her examination of the chastity movement. While the majority of teenaged girls grow up reading Seventeen magazine, Hendershot discusses two magazines, Breakaway and Brio, which offer “a Christian perspective on issues of interest to teenagers, especially issues of sexuality.” (87) Boys are expected to work out to control their sexual desires, which are viewed as quite natural. Boys are expected to be strong and athletic while girls are expected to be submissive and weak.
The promotion of waiting for sex until marriage has prompted a tremendous social movement to retain (or even reclaim) one’s virginity. In an age of sexually transmitted diseases and AIDs, Hendershot treats this issue with fairness and reserve, while recognizing that evangelical youth are subject to the wider culture’s temptations. She discusses how attuned evangelical youth are to the “wider culture’s discourses of therapy, addiction and healing.” (113) Even evangelicals have been impacted by Oprah.

Both Hankins and Hendershot make valuable contributions to understanding modern evangelical culture. This is especially important as evangelical Christians played a crucial role in the last presidential election. Both books will help academics, often uncomfortable with such individuals, to be more able to understand their beliefs and culture.

Emporia State University
Gregory L. Schneider


Here’s a surprising factoid: If you want your teenager to suffer less sexism and enjoy multiple avenues to social success, send them to a larger high school, not a smaller one. In Murray Milner, Jr.’s ethnography of high school status systems, it’s the small-town, traditional high schools that reproduce hierarchies in the most predictable ways. In larger schools, Milner, a sociologist at the University of Virginia, sees the most reasons for hope: pluralistic student cultures that offer multiple criteria for status and effectively diminish both the dominance of the “popular” crowd and the presence of gender inequality.

But high school is still no utopia. Asking, Why do American teenagers behave the way they do? Milner mines ethnographic research conducted over two years by multiple observers at “Woodrow Wilson High School” (a pseudonym for a racially and socio-economically diverse public high school of 1,200 students), plus papers by 304 undergraduates describing the status structure of the high schools they attended in some 27 states.

He ultimately finds students’ conformity, jockeying for position between groups, and fierce attention to turf protection a logical response to the circumscribed power position dealt them by adults. Excluded from true economic or political power, teens turn to the one kind of power available to them: “the power to create an informal social world in which they evaluate one another” (4). Jocks, freaks, nerds, Preps, skaters, Goths, and Gs (gangsters) all patrol the norms of group membership. Like fashionistas, groups with high status are careful to frequently complicate and redefine the norms, because they understand that status is relatively inexpansible—for one group to move up, another must move down. Thus clothing, cars, and gadgets; body language and demeanor; music, dancing, and singing; physical spaces, territories, and parties, all become means of displaying and acquiring status. To the traditional three R’s, add retailing: “Learning to consume . . . is the central lesson taught in American high schools (180).

Milner’s central argument, that teenage status systems “are an important contributing factor to the creation and maintenance of consumer capitalism” (8), is hardly earthshaking news. Madison Avenue figured this out long ago. What is new is Milner’s suggestion that adults are largely to blame for teens’ near obsession with status. By disparaging teens, segregating them from larger society, and over-accessorizing secondary education with social and sporting events, adults virtually assure that students focus not on academics, but each other.
What’s better: structuring schools so that many kinds of conformity are afforded status (athletes and musicians are valued); creating norms that emphasize solidarity and equality (randomly assigned sporting or study teams encourage cooperation; privileges linked to year-in-school increase community); decoupling education, recreation and romance (in Europe, clubs and associations, not schools, organize athletic activity, and proms, homecoming and the like are virtually nonexistent). Clearly, both Milner and Routledge are hoping for a crossover hit. Sadly, Milner’s writing style does not approach the liveliness of his subject. Despite eye-popping cover art and jacket blurbs by scholars sans their ivory tower titles, this is an academic book for an academic audience. No one else would willingly wade through this jargon. If you are looking for teen drama to go with your teen data, you are better off reading Bernard Lefkowitz’s Our Guys, an absorbing account of high school culture that serves as a sociological window into the way status is often secured through gender inequality and sexual violence.

But let’s hope secondary school administrators and policy wonks (cited by Milner as among his intended audience) do read Freaks. His structural critique is built on solid qualitative research, and (although he doesn’t address the thorny matter of implementation) he offers structural solutions to match. Given the seemingly inextricable link in the U.S. between sporting programs and alumni support, I can’t imagine schools reorganizing their extracurriculars along European lines. But then Texas A&M just renounced alumni privilege in admissions. Hope springs eternal.

Vanderbilt University

Elizabeth B. Boyd


Written from the perspective of Canadian Communications Studies, Charles Acland’s analysis of the dynamics of the contemporary deterritorialization of the global film industry provides an excellent theoretical and methodological example for those students of American Studies attempting to grapple with the problem of grounding their discipline within a context of ‘critical internationalism’. Winner of the 2004 Canadian Communication Association’s Robinson Book Prize, this analysis of the contemporary industrial and popular discourses of commercial cinema reveals the ways in which ownership of media corporations, movement of production sites, global mobility of key personnel and the search for ever further flung markets challenges the often taken-for-granted assumption that ‘Hollywood blockbusters’ are in some way ‘American’.

This emphasis upon the deracination of the idea of Hollywood from the geographical boundaries of the United States is one of the characteristics of a rich and complex work which focuses upon the film industry rather than upon specific filmic texts. Acland traces the emergence and significance of contemporary discourses of film in a global context, homing in particularly upon what he refers to as the development of an industry-wide ‘common sense’ regarding popular film consumption. During an era in which the industry has become reliant upon revenues from international audiences and from new ‘non-cinema’ markets such as TV, video, DVD and pay-per-view, Acland shows how the major studios have cultivated an understanding of their commodities as ‘mutating cultural products’ feeding, firstly, the rise of multiplex cinemas and, secondly, on the development and global spread of the ‘dedifferentiated’ Las Vegas-style shopping mall/theme park/amusement arcade/museum/cinema ‘megaplex’ developments of the early 21st century.
Rejecting simplistic notions of cultural imperialism in his interpretation of the cultural impact of these innovations, Acland stresses that ‘the global influence of film must not be mistaken as another case of the unidirectional flow of cultural commodities from the United States to the rest of the world.’ Rather, he argues, the ownership structure of the film industry represents an ‘intricate international concentration’ which combines with the global cinema-going practices of international audiences to create what he terms ‘a felt internationalism’.

An idea of particular usefulness and relevance to American Studies scholars, the concept of ‘felt internationalism’—a cosmopolitan, engaged and empowered brand of popular international awareness—appears to capture the atmosphere within which ever more discerning, informed and sophisticated global audiences interpret both global cultural products and their relationships between local, national and global cultures. Acland’s argument that the ‘shared and easily accessible sense of worldliness’ which manifests itself in the attitudes of audiences of global cinema can also be applied to audiences of other forms of popular culture (such as pop music, computer games or professional soccer) and should be taken seriously ‘as a pervasive mode for negotiating and managing reigning ideas and experiences of global economies and cultures’.

Deftly combining contemporary theories of cultural globalization with practical economic data gleaned from the trade press, promotional and fan material, this book represents a very important contribution to those contemporary debates about national cultures and global audiences in which American Studies now finds itself inextricably embroiled.

Richmond, The American International University in London

Alex Seago


“Las Vegas is on the road to being typical,” writes Hal Rothman in this portrait of his adopted home (146). Publicly-traded corporations, rather than gangsters, now finance new casinos. New arrivals from California and the Midwest build synagogues and organize Little League teams. And the needs for roads, parks, schools, and water are chipping away at Nevada’s traditions of low-tax, do-nothing government.

Combining brief narratives of life in the old days with more detailed accounts of the 1990s, Rothman makes interesting observations about life in the nation’s fastest growing metropolitan area. With demand for labor increasing faster than the native population, blue-collar unions enjoy unusual clout. To keep pace with development, police officers update their maps weekly. And sports bars specialize in teams from around the country, giving displaced migrants a chance to root for the old home team. All of this gives the reader a sense of the resident’s city.

Rothman rebuts some of the complaints about Las Vegas; for example, he argues that water scarcity is more the result of subsidized ranching and agriculture than a real limit to urban growth. But he ignores more serious criticism, especially concerns about the centrality of the casinos in the culture and economy of the city. “It is entertainment and not gaming that has redefined Las Vegas,” he asserts, at once uncritically adopting the casinos’ euphemism for gambling and ignoring statistics showing that visitors typically budget far more for gambling than for shows (34). Nor does he investigate gambling-related crime, suicide, and drug and alcohol abuse. Rothman does hint that some retirees impoverish themselves at the slot machines, and that some children are
led astray. But rather than interview the losers, he rushes on to cheerful tales about a friendly Starbucks. By pretending that a casino is no different from a theme park or a movie studio, Rothman unconvincingly presents Las Vegas as just a younger Los Angeles, a center of benign, postmodern cultural production.

Rothman’s provocative claims for his city’s normality make it particularly frustrating that his book lacks footnotes or even a bibliographical essay. Too many bold statements are supported only by anecdotes or generalization. Some stories are one-sided; anti-union casino owners appear only as irrational dunces. Others are only half-told; Rothman alludes to a “twenty-year vendetta” against University of Nevada basketball coach Jerry Tarkanian without explaining the charges against the coach (136). At one point, Rothman stoops to simple gossip, attributing an observation to “people in the know” (67). While the numerous photographs, ten of them in color, are attractive, they only rarely illustrate phenomena described in the text. A few good maps would have been more useful.

Rothman’s book is useful as a way to understand the optimist’s view of Las Vegas. But skeptical readers should compare it to David Littlejohn’s *The Real Las Vegas: Life Beyond the Strip* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), a more pessimistic, and perhaps more accurate, introduction to the city.

George Mason University

Zachary M. Schrag