

*Review Essay*

## **The Complexities of Consumption**

**James J. Farrell**

LEAD US INTO TEMPTATION: The Triumph of American Materialism. By James B. Twitchell. New York: Columbia University Press. 1999.  
ENCHANTING A DISENCHANTED WORLD: Revolutionizing the Means of Consumption. By George Ritzer. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press. 1999.  
AN ALL-CONSUMING CENTURY: Why Commercialism Won in Modern America. By Gary Cross. New York: Columbia University Press. 1999.  
CONSUMERS IN THE COUNTRY: Technology and Social Change in Rural America. By Ronald R. Kline. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 2000.  
AMERICAN DREAMS IN MISSISSIPPI: Consumers, Poverty, & Culture, 1830-1998. By Ted Ownby. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1999.  
CREATING THE MODERN MAN: American Magazines and Consumer Culture, 1900-1950. By Tom Pendegast. Columbia: University of Missouri Press. 2000.  
BUY AMERICAN: The Untold Story of Economic Nationalism. By Dana Frank. Boston: Beacon Press. 1999.

These days it's hard to consume all the new writing on consumption. It used to be that the best work in this perpetually interdisciplinary field was market research, written by professors of marketing and business management and published in places such as the *Journal of Consumer Research*, *Advances in Consumer Research*, the *Journal of Retailing*, and the *Journal of Advertising Research*. But now we academics have begun to have second thoughts about consumption. As Daniel Miller showed in his 1995 collection *Acknowledging*

*Consumption: A Review of New Studies*, scholars in a variety of disciplines have started to concentrate on the processes and characteristics of a consumption culture. In history and the social sciences, innovative researchers began to think twice about the productivist predilections of their fields.<sup>1</sup>

Of course, consumption has always been important to American culture, if not to American culture studies. From colonists' accounts of the abundance of the New World to immigrant letters about the opportunities of America, images of affluence have shaped the conversations and the cultures of the Americas, and especially the cultures of the United States. Thorstein Veblen's *Theory of the Leisure Class* located consumption at the center of American culture, as did the Lynds' *Middletown* monographs. And American studies pioneers like David Potter and David Riesman characterized Americans as *People of Plenty*, and asked *Abundance for What?*<sup>2</sup>

The books reviewed in this essay build on those traditions of scholarship. James Twitchell's *Lead Us into Temptation* is the most accessible and most provocative of the collection. He uses his introduction to question the critics of consumption, and much of the rest of the book celebrates the standard operating procedures of American consumer culture. Twitchell's criticism of consumer critics in the recycling and voluntary simplicity movements is useful, if overstated. Michael Schudson's essay "Delectable Materialism," which provides a better typology of consumer critics, is much more useful because it's more nuanced, as is Gary Cross's chapter on "Coping With Abundance" (see below).<sup>3</sup>

Twitchell builds on the dictum of Baron Isherwood and Mary Douglas that "the essential function of consumption is its capacity to make sense. Forget that commodities are good for eating, clothing, and shelter; forget their usefulness and try instead the idea that commodities are good for thinking; treat them as a nonverbal medium for the human creative faculty." Twitchell, therefore, sees American materialism as a form of both individual and cultural expression, a way of creating a kind of im-material culture. His main argument is that "such matters as branding, packaging, fashion, and even the act of shopping itself are now the central meaning-making acts in our postmodern world" (14). The book examines ads and television, branding and packaging, fashion and shopping centers, offering a lively argument for "the liberating role of consumption" (271). He argues that consumption is a matter of free choices, and that it does not go against our better judgment: it *is* our better judgment (11). A consumer populist, he refuses to see consumers as victims of commercial capitalism and contends that we shape the shopping system more than it shapes us.<sup>4</sup>

Working mainly from secondary sources, Twitchell doesn't offer many new insights to scholars of consumer culture. But he definitely packages the old ones stylishly, making this book, I guess, "new and improved." He criticizes Veblen's language, but uses Veblenian status models extensively, arguing that brands package and position themselves in order to help us position ourselves effectively.

Twitchell also accepts the common trope of the mall as a cathedral of consumption, consumption as a substitute for spirituality, and consumption communities as a replacement for religion. He develops this analogy extensively, saying, for example, that “like religion, [advertising] is an organized system of meaning for surpluses. Both sell peace of mind either in this world or in the next” (55). Twitchell has a simplistic understanding of American religion, seeing it as a kind of magic show. But even so, he offers scant evidence for this substitution effect, and religion remains important to most Americans. He would be better off looking at the *relationship* of religion and consumption, including the material culture of religion.<sup>5</sup>

Twitchell assumes a history in which people—who are *naturally* consumers—collectively create a consumer culture. But he ignores the more complex history of ideas and institutions that suggests how *some* people have considerably more influence than others. He sees history as a process of commodification—the process of making things for sale—and marketing—the process of assigning meaning to those things. But he doesn’t see that commodification and marketing originate not in all of our lives, but in the lives of particular people with particular interests. By the time most of us get to exercise our free choice in the marketplace, many other choices have already been made, including the choice of options. I might want a car that doesn’t pollute, but that hasn’t historically been an option in the market.

Only at the end—in the last three pages—does Twitchell admit his own concerns about consumer culture. Ironically, they seem to be similar to those of the critics he criticizes. But if all academics wrote as engagingly as James Twitchell, there would be more public intellectuals. I used his book in a first-year seminar on American consumer history, and students were delighted with the straightforward, provocative prose. Although there is plenty to disagree with, he gives readers a clear and cogent argument, and even his excesses engage readers in a lively, critical conversation about the patterns and purposes of consumer culture. It’s a book well worth owning and using, even if it’s a thorn in the side of uncritical consumer criticism.

George Ritzer’s *Enchanting a Disenchanted World* explores a “revolution” in American consumption. As in his earlier books—*The McDonaldization of Society* and *Expressing America*—sociologist Ritzer writes in clear and cogent English for a broad audience. Ritzer uses theories of the discipline to illuminate the culture of consumption, and vice versa, which makes the book especially useful for undergraduate classes. Drawing on Weber (for the disenchantment that comes from modern forms of rationality, authority, and bureaucracy), Marx (for the means of consumption), and Baudrillard (for ideas of implosion, spectacle, and simulacrum), Ritzer offers a creative synthesis that illuminates the new face of American chain stores, shopping centers, casinos, theme parks, and theme restaurants. He explains both how we approach the new means of consumption, and how they sell us not just commodities and entertainment, but a promise of escape from our everyday lives.<sup>6</sup>

Ritzer, who also co-edits the new *Journal of Consumer Culture*, argues that contemporary consumption vitalizes a world made lifeless by the decline of religion and the rise of routine—with its predictable efficiency, calculability, and control. He contends that the creature comforts of American life can be discomfiting because they create steady-state gratification instead of the more intense emotions and excitement that we experience as pleasure. In response to the ennui and alienation of everyday life, pioneers like Walt Disney and Bugsy Siegal created “magic kingdoms” in Anaheim and Las Vegas to restore the magic lost in the secularization and bureaucratization of modern society.

Learning first from Disneyland and then from Las Vegas, more recent entrepreneurs have created themed fantasylands across the country. From amusement parks to malls, casinos to cruise ships, merchants try to construct “cathedrals of consumption” (8-10) that help us escape the feeling of boredom of our own lives. They create thrilling extravaganzas and simulated spectacles, trying to create the commercial carnivalesque in the new sites of consumption. The simulations, which we enjoy both for their artfulness and their artificiality, are particularly interesting, because they force us to think about how the commercial construction of unreality is related to the social construction of reality—and, more broadly, what’s real and what’s not in a postmodern society.

But because this modern magic is manufactured and marketed, it’s hard to maintain it. Ritzer notes that these extravaganzas raise the threshold of boredom; “spectacles tend to grow dated and boring quite quickly” (174). In a culture of novelty, we find it difficult to be amused by the same old thing. As our fantasies become more fantastic, it takes more effort to realize them. In the early twentieth century, people were amazed by cars and electric lights, but it takes much more amusement to amaze us now.

Ritzer’s argument works well for theme parks and other themed attractions. But the theory doesn’t work as well for some means of consumption as for others, and Ritzer risks his argument on examples as tangential as gated communities, medicine and hospitals, museums and charities, and mega-churches, where it applies less well. As a result of his inclusiveness, we get a stimulating set of ideas, but not much nuance or complexity in considering any particular examples. In the same way, Ritzer overstates the importance of the new means of consumption. He’s obviously right about the spectacles of contemporary consumption. But “revolution” seems like a strong word to describe a process that’s been underway since the development of department stores in the late nineteenth century. Even Disneyland is almost fifty years old. And it’s still mostly the upscale venues that are spectacular, while many American means of consumption are still engaged in bare-bones, price-competitive provisioning. Like *The McDonaldization of Society*, *Enchanting a Disenchanted World* will provoke a lively conversation, but it won’t be the last word.

If Twitchell and Ritzer describe the contours of contemporary consumption culture, Gary Cross actually *explains* them. His *An All-Consuming Century* tells

“why commercialism won in America.” Unlike Twitchell, Cross revels in complexity. Like Charles Rosenberg, he seems to believe that “there is an aesthetic of complexity in history. Any way in which seemingly disparate developments can be brought together, any way in which the juxtaposition of unfamiliar materials can shed light on the interdependence of human life and thought, is, in itself, inherently laudable.” He delights in showing how Americans could be ambivalent about their consumption, both contributing to a consumer culture and critical of it. Cross also uses the historiography of consumer history more effectively than Twitchell and Ritzer, and he is a master of the art of historical synthesis. The result is a book that is substantive, provocative and original.<sup>7</sup>

Cross necessarily paints his portrait of the twentieth century with a broad brush, but he uses both primary and secondary sources to capture the chiaroscuro of complex consumerism. Like many consumer historians, Cross sees the emergence of a mature consumer society rooted in the rising incomes and increased production of the first third of the twentieth century. He remembers that we consume not just things but experiences, so he includes vaudeville and the dance hall, movies and amusement parks, electricity and radio in his survey. Following the Middletown studies of Robert and Helen Merrell Lynd, Cross notes that the Depression may have limited consumption, but it didn’t challenge the assumptions or basic institutions of consumption culture. During the 1930s and 1940s, for example, when the twenties were often seen as an era of excess, and the country came together in collective enterprises, Americans still defined themselves by increasing individualist consumption. We understand the fifties as a decade of almost unbridled consumption, but Cross notes that the 1950s simply enacted what the 1930s imagined.

In a chapter “Coping with Abundance,” Cross explains why the critics of consumption had so little influence in the twentieth century. Often elitist and often concealing a distaste for immigrants, women, and the working class in their appeals for tastefulness, the critics of consumption carried on a kind of cultural warfare in their criticism. Serious and sober, critics didn’t understand the “new morality of fun” (59) that made celebration not just optional but mandatory. Many of the critics of consumption also saw it as an individual matter, ignoring the social construction of consumerism and appealing to virtuous individuals to counter the social pressures for expressive individualism. They offered few critiques of consumption that addressed its intellectual and institutional foundations. Once you’ve assumed—as both consumers and critics generally did—that the world is a market, it’s hard to criticize either marketers or their clients. Writers like Paul Goodman, Charles Reich, Theodore Roszak, and E. F. Schumacher offered extensive criticism of “the system” of consumption, but their criticism was overcome by the counterculture’s loosening of restraints, and corporate America’s co-option of the rhetoric of rebellion.<sup>8</sup>

Unlike the uncritical critics of consumption, Cross is good at considering the ways in which the goods of consumption were good for people, both indi-

vidually and collectively. He contends, for example, that in a new and rapidly changing world, consumption offered an intelligible (if not always intelligent) way of understanding the self and its place in society. Cross sees consumerism as the cultural expression of our political ideals of freedom and democracy and as a system that permits individuals to connect voluntarily to communities. Thinking contextually, he shows how it gives “meaning and dignity to people, when workplace participation, ethnic solidarity, and even representative democracy have failed” (10). He contends, too, that consumption probably minimized social conflicts such as ethnic rivalries, racial discrimination, and militarism.

Cross is vociferously critical of the culture of consumption, but he is critical in the best sense of the word. Like a literary or a movie critic, he helps us to be better readers of the “text.” We understand the complexity of consumption, and we appreciate its benefits even as we also note its substantial costs—economic, political, and social.

James Twitchell and George Ritzer and Gary Cross write broadly about consumer culture, and they generally focus—as most scholars do—on metropolitan trends. But Ronald Kline and Ted Ownby challenge that perspective by writing about rural consumers. Both Kline and Ownby emphasize the *varieties* of consumption, the ways that social positions affect our responses to material goods. Unlike earlier analysts who studied advertising or marketing and concluded that people responded uncomplicatedly, Ownby and Kline see consumer culture as a pattern of call and response, with consumers sometimes calling for improvement in their lives, and advertisers sometimes promoting new and improved products to consumers. In either case, the call to consume was answered in different ways, depending on both time and circumstance.

Kline’s *Consumers in the Country* focuses on technology and social change in rural America, using case studies of telephones, cars, radio, electricity, and “modern conveniences” for the home. Kline sees consumption as a system, and focuses on what Ruth Schwartz Cowan calls “the consumption junction,” the intellectual and institutional intersection of inventors, engineers, managers, workers, advertisers, marketers, government agents, retailers, and consumers. Because he pays close attention to the agency of rural consumers, Kline is particularly good at undermining the common assumption that urban improvements gradually and uniformly permeated the countryside. He notes that rural people shared many aspects of a so-called “urban” mindset, and that they had significant experience of cities and towns. He also shows that many so-called urban technologies were actually adopted earlier in the countryside than in cities. In 1920, for example, a higher proportion of rural than urban households owned cars and telephones.

In each instance, reformers and marketers made assumptions about improvements and “convenience” in light of their own “modernization ideology.” But farmers saw their lives from a different perspective and defined modernization in their own ways. They bought telephones but used the party lines to share

music and news. They bought radios, but listened to entertainment programming instead of the educational shows that reformers thought they needed. They adopted electricity when they did not already have better ways of powering machinery, but they did not buy the full complement of electrical appliances. They bought refrigerators but did not use them year-round. They bought cars but adapted them to power farm machinery, even washing machines. In almost every instance, rural culture affected the culture of technology.

Ownby's book is exemplary social and cultural history. *American Dreams in Mississippi: Consumers, Poverty, & Culture, 1830-1998* is a brilliant history of consumption, and not just because it includes Elvis Presley's mother. Its focus on poor peoples' consumption, and on consumption in the South, makes it particularly useful to consumption historiography. Ownby studies slaves and masters, yeomen and yeo-women, storekeepers and (eventually) suburbanites, to show both their own consumption patterns and how they shaped each other's consumption patterns. Each of these diverse groups, Ownby says, participated as consumers in several American Dreams: the dream of abundance, the dream of a democracy of goods, the dream of freedom of choice, and the dream of novelty. All of these dreams depended on the idea of progress. Mississippians used goods to define different conceptions of the good life and to define each other. As a result, consumer culture was also political culture.

*American Dreams in Mississippi* shows brilliantly how race shaped consumption and vice versa. In an era of slavery, white Americans largely determined consumption patterns for black Americans, doling out food and clothing and occasional treats to their slaves. Slaves, who *were* goods, still participated in the social construction of goods—and of consumption. They did odd jobs to participate in the money economy, and they spent their money on things that mattered to them. To some extent, their spending was an assertion of freedom and individuality, a rebellion against a system that demeaned them daily.

Ownby shows how white men defined women and slaves as the consummate consumers—negative reference groups characterized by impulse, indulgence, immediate gratification, and wastefulness—even at a time when men did most of the shopping, in the male preserve of the general store. Seated around the cracker barrel, drinking and telling homespun stories, white men made the general store an uncomfortable place for women and African Americans. Not until the coming of the department store (for women) and mail order (for African Americans) could these groups shop without a threat of humiliation. These new shopping institutions—along with pictorial ads, installment buying, and the modern commercial Christmas—began a transformation of consumption in the South between 1880 and 1920, although different groups experienced the changes at different rates. Gradually, Mississippians like Gladys Smith (Elvis Presley's mother) thought less about thrift and caution as virtues in self-sufficient households and more about individual indulgence in an interdependent cash economy.

Ownby explains the everyday changes in consumption, but he also explores the imaginative world of consuming passions. Chapters on the blues and on Southern literature explore the ideas about consumption contained in these expressive forms. Ownby argues convincingly that the blues weren't just an elegy for a world gone by but a way of making sense of the material culture of modernity—clothes, cars, and other consumer goods that offered imaginative possibilities for a satisfying life for people moving (socially and geographically) beyond their agricultural roots. And he mines the fiction of Will Percy, Richard Wright, William Faulkner, and Eudora Welty for their insights on the complex interactions of consumer culture and tradition. On the one hand, consumer culture assaulted traditional Southern culture; on the other hand, it provided creative possibilities for people traditionally assaulted by the racist patriarchy of Southern institutions.

In the same way, Ownby's treatment of the Civil Rights Movement emphasizes the ways in which it was also a consumer rights movement. African Americans had learned the connections between freedom and consumption, and they understood their freedom not just politically but economically and socially as well. Consumption was a way of producing a new self and a new society. Given the limitations of the old society, it looked pretty good. More recently, even Wal-Mart looked better than the local store stocked with local prejudices.

In *Creating the Modern Man: American Magazines and Consumer Culture, 1900-1950*, Tom Pendergast explores the role of magazines in changing American gender roles. Like earlier scholars of American gender, his study focuses mainly on magazines. But Pendergast doesn't confuse the prescriptive and the descriptive and is very careful about not overstating the effects of magazines. Just as Ronald Kline sees technological diffusion as a system of feedback loops, so Pendergast treats magazines as a system connecting changes in work and home and the economy to the imaginative lives of editors, advertisers, writers, illustrators, and readers. Then and now, magazines are a medium for reconciling different interests in a single publication. Using correspondence and business records, Pendergast shows how editors shaped magazines to fit readers and their own ideals of how men should act in the modern world. And he suggests that men were not duped into this new masculinity, but found it a positive change from Victorian ideals that were increasingly difficult to enact in new conditions.<sup>9</sup>

The new social construction of masculinity took shape slowly and haltingly in the early years of the twentieth century; it was not a foregone conclusion. Pendergast shows how masculine Victorian ideals emphasized self-restraint, dedication, industriousness, and integrity. The newer models of masculinity emphasized "personality, sexuality, self-realization, and a fascination with appearances, all traits that made men well-suited to participate in the social and economic institutions of this period" (13). They were an adaptation to a changing economy and society, helping men cope with the new demands of corporate

capitalism. But modern manners never completely replaced the Victorian etiquette of manhood, and most American men still hear a Victorian echo among the voices that help us interpret the world.

Pendergast shows how new ideals of masculinity depended on definitions of femininity that were opportunistic at best, misogynist at worst. Convincing men to read a fashion magazine was not an easy task when fashion was considered feminine or homosexual. Editors resorted to a compensatory chest-thumping masculinity that depended on sexual jokes and illustrations. Magazines apparently needed to make objects of women in order to sell objects to men.

Like Ted Ownby, Tom Pendergast also pays attention to the racial dimensions of American consumer culture. In *Creating the Modern Man*, he is careful to show that all men were not created equal—or at the same time. The “modern masculinity” of predominantly white magazines presumed civil and commercial rights; it presumed good work and purchasing power; it presumed that there were not more pressing concerns than self-construction and sociability. But these presumptions proved false for many black men, who therefore adhered to Victorian models of masculinity—with an emphasis on work and achievement—for most of the early twentieth century. Not until the publication of *Ebony* in 1945 did a successful African American magazine fully embrace the more consumerist tenets of modern manhood.

*Creating the Modern Man* is an excellent history, reflective and reflexive. It would be even better if it were possible for Pendergast to venture outside the magazines and into the lived experience of magazine readers. How did one live differently (if at all) after reading *Esquire*? After looking at *Petty Girls* or *Varga Girls*, how did men treat the women in their lives? What were the real effects of buying a suit that promised to make you modern and masculine? If American magazines had not changed between 1900 and 1950, would men have lived differently? Kline uses the surveys of rural sociologists and researchers to do a reality check on the rhetoric of his reformers; it would be wonderful to find similar data that would tell us more about the meaning of magazines to American men and manhood.

Unlike the other books reviewed here, Dana Frank’s *Buy American: The Untold Story of Economic Nationalism* explicitly emphasizes the international dimensions of American consumer culture. Although she begins with the consumer boycotts and non-importation acts of the American Revolution and spends some time exploring the economic nationalism of nineteenth- and twentieth-century tariff debates, she focuses primarily on the various Buy American campaigns of the twentieth century. In each section, she explains the origins of the policy and its complexity. In each case, she shows that economic nationalism involved a restrictive definition of the nation, profiting some people but not others.

The best chapter is on “the ILGWU, the Union Label, and the Import Question.” The 1970s, with its oil crisis, “stagflation,” and deindustrialization led the

International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union to try to solve the economic crises. As textile jobs moved overseas, and as apparel imports increased, the ILGWU began an advertising campaign asking consumers to "look for the union label"—one featuring the phrase "Made in the U.S.A." In some ads, the union also raised the specter of what Frank calls "Yellow Apparel"—clothing manufactured by poorly-paid workers in Japan, Taiwan, or Hong Kong.

What the ads failed to mention is that ILGWU contracts specified that American corporations using non-union labor—and especially non-union labor overseas—would pay "liquidated damages"—a payment prorated to the sales price of the goods produced—to the union itself. In this way, the union profited from the conditions it so eloquently protested. And union leadership could maintain a semblance of solvency, even as membership dropped. What the ads also neglected to mention was the importance of American trade policy in pushing apparel production overseas. During the Cold War, the United States curried favor with neutral or left-leaning nations by making it easy for them to produce apparel for the huge American market. Such policies accelerated during the anti-union Reagan Administration. In 1984, Frank reports, four Jamaican firms produced clothes for U.S. corporations; by 1987, the number had risen to seventy, employing 20,000 people for manufacturing name-brand American apparel.

With worldwide protests over the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, and with controversies over NAFTA closer to home, Frank's book is timely. Like Naomi Klein's *No Logo: Money, Marketing, and the Growing Anti-Corporate Movement*, it reminds us that consumer goods are produced not just in factories, but in legislation and trade agreements, and in corporate board rooms. They remind us, too, that malls of America may be located in the United States, but they are intricately interconnected to the world.<sup>10</sup>

Taken together, these books teach us a lot about the cultures of consumption and about the study of consumption. They remind us to keep our definitions of consumption broad—including ethereal products such as electricity, self-confidence, status, and masculinity. They remind us that consumers are producers too, manufacturing both consumer culture and the culture of production that feeds it. They remind us that there are many cultures of consumption, all determined by choice, and all determined also by factors such as race and class and gender and geography that delimit our choices. They remind us that power is exercised in every act of consumption, and that consumer history is, therefore, a form of political history. They remind us that American consumption depends on the world and on the planet. They remind us that our consumer culture has been produced by innumerable acts of people in the past, and so they reassure us that we are making history now, as we shop at Wal-Mart, or turn on the lights, or watch TV.

## Notes

1. Daniel Miller, ed., *Acknowledging Consumption: A Review of New Studies* (London: Routledge, 1995).
2. David Potter, *People of Plenty: Economic Abundance and the American Character* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954); David S. Riesman, *Abundance for What? And Other Essays* (New York: Doubleday, 1964).
3. Michael Schudson, "Delectable Materialism: Second Thoughts on Consumer Culture," in *Consumer Society in American History: A Reader*, ed. Lawrence B. Glickman (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999).
4. Mary Douglas and Baron Isherwood, *The World of Goods: Toward an Anthropology of Consumption* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1978), 62.
5. See, for example, Robert Wuthnow's *God and Mammon in America* (New York: Free Press, 1994), and his edited volume, *Rethinking Materialism: Perspectives on the Spiritual Dimension of Economic Behavior* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1995). See also Bruce David Forbes and Jeffrey H. Mahan, eds., *Religion and Popular Culture in America* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000).
6. George Ritzer, *The McDonaldization of Society: An Investigation into the Changing Character of American Social Life* (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press, 1993); Ritzer, *Expressing America: A Critique of the Global Credit Card Society* (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press, 1995). See also George Ritzer and Elizabeth L. Malone, "Globalization Theory: Lessons from the Exportation of McDonaldization and the New Means of Consumption," *American Studies* 41 (Summer/Fall 2000), 97-118, which situated the processes of McDonaldization and consumption in the debate of globalization.
7. Charles Rosenberg, "Science and American Social Thought," in *Science and Society in the U.S.*, ed. David Van Tassel and Michael Hall (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1966), 162.
8. See, for example, Tom Frank, *The Conquest of Cool: Business Culture, Counterculture, and the Rise of Hip Consumerism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).
9. See also Pendergast's article, "Horatio Alger Doesn't Work Here Any More: Masculinity and American Magazines, 1919-1940," *American Studies* 38 (Spring 1997), 55-80.
10. Naomi Klein, *No Logo: Money, Marketing, and the Growing Anti-Corporate Movement* (New York: Picador, 1999).