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The fiftieth anniversary of the launching of Sputnik in 1957 produced a wave of space history volumes. These two are National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) center histories. Both are political and institutional chronicles, not scientific ones. Westwick’s volume is a sequel to Clayton R. Koppes’ J.P.L. and the American Space Program of 1983, and concerns the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL), NASA’s best-known (and best-advertised) planetary research and development center. LiPartito and Butler’s book is a sequel to earlier volumes on NASA’s chief space launch operations facility at Cape Canaveral in Florida. Both Westwick’s and LiPartito and Butler’s books accent the managerial challenges of the Space Age after the Apollo lunar program ended in 1973.

In both well-written narratives, personalities and people matter. Bureaucratic structures are inevitable in complex applied science and engineering projects. But the qualities of specific managers matter as much or more than organization charts.

Westwick’s volume is the more organizationally focused. JPL is a uniquely hybrid, university-affiliated, center within NASA. It is both “private” and “public,” depending upon its specific political and financial circumstances. It is also the only NASA center where civil service rules do not normally apply, and which solicits work from the private sector and from other government agencies, both civilian and military. JPL’s institutional roles include being a bridge via which R&D in secret military and intelligence space projects passes over into the civilian space program.

Westwick is good at discussing the “increasing symbiosis” between the military and civilian space programs during and after the 1980s in technology areas like microelectronics and supercomputing (143-145). “The military,” he rightly concludes, “is the elephant in the living room of the U.S. space program” (309). Westwick has no essential complaints with what his predecessor Koppes called the “national security state.” He thus presents a collection of primary explanations for key organizational and policy changes at JPL and
lets the reader select among them. He also occasionally argues, on the basis of unclear or anecdotal evidence, that JPL, NASA, or “the American public” had no stomach for various things—like risky space missions that were not directly related to military projects (284).

Overall, Westwick sees the men who led JPL as illustrating three major eras in the lab’s modern history: post-Apollo salesmanship; 1980’s remilitarization of outer space; and the end of the Cold War in the 1990s. Academic Bruce Murray, a friend of astronomer Carl Sagan, comes across badly. Presented as an inexperienced manager selected for “political salesmanship and public engagement,” Murray antagonized JPL and NASA staff with his “missionary zeal” and an organizational “fire drill atmosphere” in which the lab went from “one crisis to another” from 1976 to 1982 (17, 22, 73). Revitalization was accomplished, from 1982 to 1991, by Lew Allen, an Air Force General, spymaster, and physics PhD who did not seek to change JPL’s civilian-military “organizational culture,” and who replaced “quiet negotiations” for “perpetual crisis mode” (126, 127). Under Allen, the first non-CalTech head of JPL, the center diversified its work, but “lost schedule and work discipline” in ways that produced a string of embarrassing and expensive spacecraft failures in the late 1980s. Under the leadership of academic Ed Stone, from 1991 to 2001, the lab dealt successfully with the “scattershot” and “overbearing” demands of NASA head Dan Goldin, but internal project oversight and review suffered. Finally, Charles Elachi of CalTech brought the lab into the present.

This book well plots organizational and technological dynamics as JPL leaders moved the lab into new R&D arenas. But Westwick merely mentions two elements crucial to JPL’s success. Internally, there is JPL’s “Deep Space Network” communications infrastructure. Externally, there is Hollywood, located all of 35 miles away. Westwick understands Southern California’s entertainment industry and its aerospace industry have had multifaceted connections, but he limits his discussion to image processing.

In LiPartito and Butler’s volume, the “design culture” of JPL gives way to the “operations culture” of the Kennedy Space Center. Whereas Westwick generally approves of a “systems engineering” approach he assumes readers understand, LiPartito and Butler support an older “scientific laboratory” culture and provide a clear explanation of the differences between the two organizational systems (119-120). Whereas Westwick’s narrative focuses on top managers, LiPartito and Butler’s also concerns middle managers and workers. While Westwick uses interviews and internal center documents, LiPartito and Butler season such data from local newspapers.

The Space Age, accordingly, has a more human face in the latter volume. The faces are sometimes female, for example, and they are not always enthusiastic about NASA or spaceflight. The authors argue that there is no fast and certain boundary between designing a spacecraft and operating it. You do not just build something and ship it to the Cape and shoot it off. In the process of setting up complex systems, unexpected problems develop and have to be resolved. So, a lowly technician can trump someone very satisfied with the wonderful workings of their mind. Such human interactions, not dehumanized structures and ideologies—systems management or other—is what determines whether something works. “The living breathing reality of operations and the lessons learned there have, however, been ‘written out’ of the history of the Space Age” (403).

Memorable examples of what the authors are talking about occur in their coverage of the Space Shuttle. First, the degree of cannibalization of parts from one shuttle to another may surprise those who have not had to keep military aircraft flying. Second, the lack of attention to “incorporating operational concepts into the design of space vehicles” before
2000 will help the reader understand why 1970s and 1980s blather that shuttles could be operated like airplanes was bogus from the start, even if designers did not know it (373).

Overall, the “tension between invention and use, between design and operation, which lies at the heart” of LiPartito and Butler’s book helps to show just how different NASA centers are. The authors well conclude: “Some of the conflict that divides the agency is political (who gets what); some is historical (where you came from, who taught you)” (404).

Lake Erie College
Kim McQuaid


In this insightful reflection, drawing widely from literary, historical, and scientific sources, distinguished cultural historian Martha Banta poses “the burning question” of whether a distinctively American aesthetic is at work in the art and literature of the late nineteenth century. Her title invokes Emerson’s prophecy, in the introduction to Nature, that “whenever a true theory appears” that can explain the creative and the spiritual as science explains the physical, “it will be its own evidence” and will “explain all phenomena.” In the three long essays that compose this book, Banta seeks such a theory.

Comparisons between science and art became an obsession of America’s leading intellectuals in the late nineteenth century. Science flourished under the banner of positivism, rejecting any claims without empirical warrant. “Modern man rejects the priest, the moralist, or the lawyer as his final arbiter,” wrote Thorstein Veblen: to be modern, he insisted, is to be a man of science (1). Taking up this challenge, writers created new modes of literature embodying the spirit of empiricism. Banta offers a probing critical assessment of the work of Veblen, Zola, Henry James, Theodore Dreiser, and Frank Norris, placing them alongside contemporary literary and art criticism. Her analysis alternates with “fictive interjections” from characters who embody the tensions between science and art. In the novels she discusses, these characters confront the “anxieties of modernity.”

Part Two, entitled “Capitol of Best Intentions,” looks for a distinctively American aesthetic in the history of Washington, D.C. In this section—twice as long as the other two—she sets the “new Rome” against the “old Rome,” from ancient monuments to Renaissance paintings and sculptures. Tracing a century of planning, construction, and reconstruction on the Potomac, she shows how Washington has symbolized American ambitions and achievements, and hence—so she argues—given concrete expression to the American aesthetic spirit.

The interpolated Italian parallels in this section are frequently strained, and a lengthy critique of twentieth-century war monuments takes us far off the main route. Returning to the nineteenth century, she closes with a fine analysis of why murals, especially those decorating government buildings, are the cultural equivalent of Europe’s Old Masters. But she misses one delectable irony: the capital was built on the banks of Tiber Creek, its name grandly invoking the Roman original, but by the 1870s this watercourse had been channeled entirely underground.

Part Three examines the ability of art to answer scientific challenges in fictional characters who “define their lives (and with striking frequency, go to their deaths) as artists” (viii). As examples Banta offers an eclectic assortment of novels by James, Norris, Dreiser, Norris, and Virginia Woolf—even Rudyard Kipling and Jack London. Here she is at her best, enriching careful textual readings with far-fetched but telling comparisons. In one virtuosic passage on ascending and descending stairways, she links Alberti’s advice to
painters, Canaletto’s Venetian cityscapes, Piranesi’s and Escher’s enigmatic architectural drawings, and “the narrative architectures of James’s The Golden Bowl” (223-225).

Banta’s writing can be baroque in its richness, idiosyncratic in its style. She sometimes avoids using the authorial first person, for example, by referring to her book and its sections in the third person. (“Henry James’s contributions leave their marks throughout One True Theory . . .” [xxviii]; “Part Three will lay out . . . but first there is Part Two . . . .” [57].) Whether the three sections really form one project, as the introduction insists, is questionable. Part Three stops abruptly, with no review of what has gone before and no satisfying answer to the “burning question.”

Yet Banta’s gift for careful reading and her wide intellectual range bring to light parallels few others are equipped to discern. In showing how the arts sometimes sought to satisfy, sometimes to defy, the demands of a scientific age, Banta deepens our understanding of American history and culture.

Calvin College

David A. Hoekema


Radio’s America offers a critical media analysis about the loss of individual expression, resulting in homogenization of public messages. By blurring the lines between the individual and mass culture, Bruce Lenthall argues, radio’s power diminishes individual autonomy within that mass communication system.

Lenthall contends that broadcasting structure does not allow for competing stations or diverse voices (33). As a critical broadcast history of one decade, the research context within the big picture of radio history is missing. Broadcast historians Christopher Sterling, et al. (Stay Tuned 2002) contend that by the 1930s, radio programming was half national and half local (180) and that by 1938, an FCC report found that 50 to 70 percent of programming came from networks, with 52 percent of it music.

Lenthall focuses only on the narrative elite programming. While he gives an admirable synthesis of the negative responses to racial stereotyping in “Amos ‘n’ Andy” and the lack of network access for talented Langston Hughes, Lenthall ignores the network African American musicians: Duke Ellington, Eubie Blake, Paul Robeson, etc. Radio’s America misses how local radio programming served American communities, college campuses, and farms with local events, regional music, sports, morning wake-ups, religious services, and crop reports. Nor is the programming of the joint station and newspaper local ownership discussed. Rather, Lenthall follows the capitalist critique of James Rorty and Ruth Brindze, that the near monopoly of the networks served the interests of corporate capitalism.

The author expounds on the creative dramas of Orson Wells and Archibald MacLeish, but more as aberrations, and sticks to the premise that advertising limits artistic speech (205) by network obsession with listener numbers. With easy redistribution of identical cultural forms, radio reached a largely undifferentiated audience as one. The majority preferences impacted the individual, whether politically or sociologically, as Alexis de Tocqueville found earlier.

Lenthall refers to Roosevelt’s two broadcast goals. FDR did indeed initially use radio as a way to distribute information, reassure, and give hope to the nation crippled by the economy. Yet, without evidence Lenthall also writes that Roosevelt’s “belief” (87) was that radio could enable him “to enhance his political power.” By World War II, FDR’s
administration relied on radio more in paradoxical ways: simultaneously empowering and manipulative.

Lenhall states that 1930s radio changed America to a narrow, mass consumer culture that also limited liberal democracy in contemporary life. Rather, radio was just one of the twentieth century mass media forms; earlier, mass magazines filled with national advertising also built a consumer culture.

Specific chapters cover public intellectuals’ responses to radio, audiences’ personal reactions to particular programs, and participatory radio democracy by Roosevelt and other broadcast champions. Most useful are chapter summations of early radio research and major radio writers’ artistic efforts.

The extensive primary research is impressive. Yet, without context and placement the author goes too far: the “interconnected and vast society of the twentieth century made older notions of participatory and local democracy seem nonsensical” (7). This belies Robert Putnam’s social capital findings of twentieth-century community civic engagement (Bowling Alone 2000) and the higher voter turnout statistics in the 1936 and 1940 elections.

University of Missouri, Columbia
Betty Houchin Winfield


Les Harrison’s densely argued and amply illustrated treatment of nineteenth-century U.S. literature and museum culture begins with Duncan Cameron’s formulation of the museum’s two roles in a democracy: it may serve as a *temple*, codifying for visitors the values of the powerful, or it may function as a *forum*, offering the public a “place for ‘confrontation, experimentation, and debate’” (xiv). For Harrison, these terms are not prescriptive but descriptive of the competing, complementary visions of what Tony Bennett terms “the exhibitionary complex” (xviii) as it evolved in the U.S. over the course of the nineteenth century. And these terms rest at the heart of his occasionally labored but often ingenious analyses of works by Hawthorne, Melville, Stowe, and Whitman.

After a preface surveying relevant critical terrain, Harrison provides a tasty chapter tracing the development of the exhibitionary complex through three museums. Charles Willson Peale attempted (without success) to secure with his temple, the Philadelphia Museum, a single vision of social order, while P. T. Barnum “refus[ed] to provide customers with stable interpretive authority” in his populist American Museum of New York (29). And the National Museum at the Smithsonian Institution in D.C., not founded until 1879, employed “surveiling, regulatory technologies” (39) that helped rectify the institution’s public space and scientific mission. This chapter establishes the importance of architecture and locale for Harrison, who expertly reads the institutional meaning of physical sites.

Harrison shows in subsequent chapters how each of the four central authors exhibited the cultural tensions manifested in museums—tensions related to the development of national culture and evolution of the U.S. public sphere, which he describes (contra Habermas) as undergoing democratic expansion rather than declension in this period. In his tales and romances, Hawthorne considered the tension between the temple of official history and the forum of fiction. Indeed, argues Harrison, Hawthorne’s last novel, *The Marble Faun*, represents the culmination of a career spent reflecting on “those physical sites and structures where the dramas of cultural authority are enacted” (50). When the commercial success represented by the Barnum-esque forum came to elude Melville,
writes Harrison, the author confronted it in Moby-Dick; the whaling novel represents Melville’s negotiation of New York culture and his strong discomfort with both the control of the temple and the manipulation of the forum by Ahab-esque showmen. In Uncle Tom’s Cabin, Stowe secured a sentimental Christian interpretation of the novel’s wide-ranging events through a Peale-like narrator, but when the novel was brought in 1853 by playwrights H. J. Conway and George L. Aiken to the stages of Barnum’s American Museum and A. H. Purdy’s National Theatre, respectively, that narrative control was replaced with ideological instability. Finally, Harrison describes the democratic poet of Leaves of Grass as surprisingly uncomfortable with the representational practices of the popular museum. In the postbellum Specimen Days (1882), Whitman consolidated under a structure reminiscent of the grand iron dome of the U.S. capitol (completed after the war) a stabilizing, Smithsonian-like institutional vision of national union.

With its attention to institutional sites as expressions and arbiters of contested cultural models, The Temple and the Forum joins an American Studies tradition represented by such scholars as Karen Haltunnen, John Kasson, and Lawrence Levine (all of whom Harrison cites). Anyone interested in U.S. literature, performance studies, or theorizations of the public sphere will find much of interest.

University of Kansas

Laura L. Mielke


In this powerful and complex book Ussama Makdisi tells the story of As‘ad Shidyaq, a Maronite from Mount Lebanon who was the first Arab convert to American Protestantism.

The first part of the book establishes the context of the story in North America and in the Levant. The men who employed As‘ad and who became his spiritual mentors were sent out by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, founded in 1810. Whereas one might have expected to find the roots of American Christian missions in the Middle East in centuries-old European anti-Islamic prejudice, Makdisi convincingly shows that the ABCFM, the first American foreign missions organization, developed its missiology in the utterly American encounter with the North American Indians. And while it is true that Ottoman authorities did not permit proselytizing among Muslim populations, this did not necessitate any revision of missionary priorities, since for them pope and prophet were equally imposters and the “nominal” Christians of the Middle East their targets every bit as much as were Muslims. This was especially so of the Maronites, Eastern Christians in communion with Rome. Indeed the main threat the missionaries posed to Maronite church authority lay in exposing its myth of perpetual orthodoxy. Meanwhile the Maronite church found allies in the Ottoman authorities, who shared its commitment to traditional social hierarchies.

The conversion narrative takes up the second part of the book. Makdisi’s sympathetic account presents As‘ad Shidyaq as neither the greedy traitor to his native community of the patriarch’s accusations nor the martyr for evangelical individualism of the hagiographical missionary newsletters. Rather, As‘ad emerges as a man whose life was transformed through a close devotional study of the New Testament. As‘ad’s own description of his physical suffering and inner spiritual struggle during his imprisonment and torture at the hands of the patriarch’s thugs opens the door for Makdisi to find a human being who is not reducible to simplistic narratives.
Makdisi’s real hero appears in the third part of the book. He is Butrus al-Bustani, a major figure in Arab intellectual and cultural life in the second half of the nineteenth century. Bustani, himself a Maronite convert to Protestantism, published a biography of As’ad Shidyaq through which he advocated a freedom of conscience “from above, granted to humanity after it had been purchased and solidly sealed by the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ” (201). For Bustani, “the unwanted apostle for an ecumenical humanism which the American mission had never intended,” (211) religious coexistence was not a strategy of empire as it was for the Ottomans, nor was it a disingenuous tactic of Christian evangelism as it was for missionaries. It was a “way of life,” a means for humans to “overcome their temporary differences and unite around their essential sameness” (213). Thus locating the origins of modern religious tolerance as much in faith itself as in loss of faith, Makdisi’s book demands attention well beyond a scholarly audience and deserves to be widely read.

Calvin College

Douglas A. Howard


Nearly a decade has passed since 9/11, the demarcation line separating the remnants of the Cold War from the panoptic War on Terror. Yet even today, the most alarming and potentially deadly threat emanates from so-called rogue nations intent on developing atomic capabilities. Indeed, the Cold War and its atomic standoff between the United States and the Soviet Union may be fading into history. The atomic bomb, however, remains not only a subject of political debate and diplomacy, but a stimulus for renewed concern about civil defense and survival.

The bomb’s presence in our political and social consciousness continues to spark scholarship about its historical beginnings and lingering impact. Among this scholarship are two books offering new interpretations and insights about the development of the atomic bomb, the creation and shaping of the Cold War, and the bomb’s influence on American society.

In The Atomic Bomb and the Origins of the Cold War, authors Campbell Craig, professor of international relations at the University of South Hampton, and Sergey Radchenko, a tutorial fellow in international history at the London School of Economics, examine the beginnings of the Cold War from a political perspective, focusing on the viewpoints and policies of Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Joseph Stalin, and their respective advisors. The Atomic Bomb and American Society: New Perspectives contains papers originally presented at a 2005 conference of the same name. Edited by Rosemary B. Mariner, lecturer in history at the University of Tennessee, and G. Kurt Piehler, associate professor of history and former director of the Center for the Study of War and Society at the University of Tennessee, the book covers political, scientific, social, and cultural subjects.

Central to Craig and Radchenko’s thesis is that the atomic bomb played a central role in determining the policies of the United States and the Soviet Union in the immediate postwar world. Using new Soviet documentation commingled with secondary sources, the authors argue further that the U.S. was responsible for initiating the Cold War, tracing its beginning to the early 1940s. Franklin Roosevelt, they point out, wanted “a new world order shaped by Wilsonian principles” and governed by the “four policemen”: the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China (3). Roosevelt’s untimely death
on April 11, 1945, however, altered the diplomatic landscape. Although Truman learned about the Manhattan Project on his first day as president, his initial approach to atomic politics emulated that of his predecessor. “Like Roosevelt,” the authors write, “Truman wanted to use the atomic bomb both as a stick to intimidate the Soviet Union with respect to its occupation of Eastern Europe and as a carrot with respect to the creation of a serious postwar international order” (63). But Truman’s growing distrust of Stalin toughened his stance. Craig and Radechenko even suggest that Truman’s decision to drop a second atomic bomb before Japan had adequate time to consider surrender was based largely on preventing the Soviet Union from entering the war and having a postwar role in Japan. “[T]o put it a bit crudely,” they write, “we can regard Hiroshima as the final American strike of the Second World War, and Nagasaki as its first strike in the Cold War” (89).

The authors also delve into Stalin’s psyche, albeit somewhat questionably, concerning his views of Roosevelt, Truman, and the atomic bomb. They argue that following Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Stalin, whose own nuclear program had languished since 1942, wanted an atomic bomb at any cost. Thus, as the Allies celebrated victory in World War II, Stalin focused on developing his own atomic bomb, which he deemed critical for the Soviet Union’s protection, as well as necessary for his country to play a major role in the postwar great-power order. Despite his support for the establishment of the United Nations’ Atomic Energy Commission, as long as it was placed under the ultimate control of the Security Council, in which the Soviet Union had veto power, Stalin believed conflict with the West was inevitable and would occur more quickly because of the atomic bomb. “Hiroshima became one of a number of important milestones,” the authors write, “indicating to Stalin that this conflict would come sooner than later” (110).

The failure to enact international atomic controls, derailed largely by the discovery of atomic espionage, coupled with the intensification of distrust between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in the late 1940s, solidified the Cold War and sparked the atomic arms race. The authors write: “The bomb blew away [the] image of stability, already complicated by mistrust and misperceptions on both sides” (xxv). Although the authors fail to delve more fully into other significant events of the day, such as Stalin’s control of Eastern Europe, including East Germany, their main points are interesting and provocative. They also acknowledge the wider influence of the bomb, which, they write, played “a starring role in the political, cultural, and social history of the contemporary era—a period coterminous with history’s last great-power rivalry, the Cold War of 1945-1991” (ix).

The bomb’s starring role is documented in The Atomic Bomb and American Society: New Perspectives. Topics include civil defense and rural America, the Cuban missile crisis, the women of Los Alamos, profiles of American scientists, and popular representations of nuclear weapons in the 1950s, to name a few. Of note are three articles offering fresh perspectives and research about the bomb and American society.

Paul S. Boyer, author of the pinnacle study of postwar America, By the Bomb’s Early Light: American Thought and Culture at the Dawn of the Atomic Age, opens the book. His article, “Nuclear Themes in American Culture, 1945 to the Present,” divides the Cold War into three distinctive periods, “each marked by a surge of political activism and cultural expression, followed by an interval of comparative quiescence and diminished attention”: 1945 to the mid-1950s, mid-1950s through the late 1970s, and the late 1970s to the early 1990s (4). The opening of the atomic age in 1945, followed by the successful test of the atomic bomb by the Soviet Union in 1949, raised people’s fears, which began to wane as the 1950s unfolded. By the mid-’50s, civil defense, duck ‘n’ cover drills, and Nike-Hercules missile installations again raised Americans’ fear level, only to subside slowly over the next two decades. Then, in the late 1970s, with India’s test of a nuclear
device, President Jimmy Carter’s withdrawal of the SALT II agreement from the Senate, and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the fear level rose once again.

Robert Hunter, a historian of twentieth-century United States politics, examines three films dealing with nuclear terrorism, a topic of relevance even today: The 49th Man (1953), Hell and High Water (1954), and Port of Hell (1954). Hunter points out that these were the only films in the 1950s to discuss the danger of atomic sabotage, including smuggling an atomic bomb into the country by dividing it into pieces, placing a nuclear arsenal within striking distance of the United States, and sneaking a bomb into the United States through a port of call. Writes Hunter: “[The movies] warned of nuclear terrorism yet offered the strangely comforting message that other people—usually elites or authority figures—would handle everything. In so doing, these pictures remained true to the consensus culture of the Eisenhower years. Things might get a little hairy, but everything would work out for the best” (233).

Judy Barrett Litoff, history professor at Bryant University in Smithfield, Rhode Island, offers a unique glimpse into women’s views of the atomic bomb in “Over the Radio Yesterday I Heard the Starting of Another War: Women’s Wartime Correspondence, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and the End of World War II.” The letters, which include both military and civilian women from across the country, express relief the war has ended and that America was the first country to develop the bomb, but they also question the morality of killing thousands of innocent civilians and express concern about the future of uncontrolled atomic development. “The postwar world that loomed before United States women,” she writes, “presented a picture that was dim and unclear” (97).

The two books cited here help enlighten and clarify the history of the atomic bomb and how its constant presence and Apocalyptic threat affected—and continues to affect—America’s life and times. Writes Boyer: “Whatever the future holds, one thing is clear about the past: If we are to understand the full meaning and impact of nuclear weapons created more than sixty years ago … we must look at more than the actions of scientists, politicians, generals, strategists, and diplomats. We must also extend our horizon to include the arts and the humanities, and even the raucous arena of mass entertainment” (15). Taken together, these books, despite some weaknesses and areas open for debate, succeed overall in offering new insights spanning science, politics, society, and the arts that elevate our understanding of the atomic world in which we live.

Independent Scholar

Michael Scheibach


The essays in Baseball in America & America in Baseball, which benefits from an introduction by the distinguished historian of sport Richard C. Crepeau, originated in the Walter Prescott Webb Lectures at the University of Texas at Arlington in 2006. David Vaught focuses on baseball in small towns in California’s Sacramento Valley in the second half of the 19th century. In “‘Our Players Are Mostly Farmers,’” he traces the rise of interest in baseball in the towns of Davisville and Dixon at a time when other historians have claimed precedence for baseball in urban areas, suggesting more complexity in the transition to “modern” values and institutions.

In “Invisible Baseball,” Samuel O. Regalado explores how Japanese Americans used sport to satisfy several needs. First-generation Issei hoped that their offspring would find baseball a bridge into integration into American society, while the Nisei, born in the United States, sought a sense of identity compatible with the American values of teamwork and
competitiveness. Ironically, Regalado shows, despite commonalities between Japanese and American ways (baseball, for example, had appealed to the competitive spirit in Meiji Japan), Nisei baseball was essentially segregated, noticed little beyond their own communities.

Daniel A. Nathan examines the rather brief history of the Baltimore Black Sox in “Chasing Shadows,” a worthwhile case study of the sometimes tenuous status of African American teams in the era of the Negro League. More than other contributors, Nathan makes the methodological challenges of studying sometimes marginalized groups a recurrent motif.

In impressive and persuasive detail, Steven A. Riess explores “The Profits of Major League Baseball, 1900-1956,” demonstrating that major league franchises were very good investments in line posting growth as seen in industry overall. Over time, wealthier individuals and large corporations gravitated to this investment focus, succeeding the ambitious but less extravagantly wealthy men on the make who had predominated earlier.

Mark Dyreson uses his special talent for cultural analysis in “Mapping an Empire of Baseball,” examining sometimes awkward efforts to spread baseball in places such as fascist Italy and Nazi Germany, as well as better-known cases in Latin America and elsewhere. Dyreson shows the mix of boosterish enthusiasm with cultural bias and even racism, as when disinterest in baseball in Africa was given a race-based explanation.

Finally, in “‘Matters Involving Honor,’” Benjamin G. Rader keenly explores the violent life of Ty Cobb, so often attributed to possible psychological instability, as a reflection of a particular cultural code of honor related not just to the American South in general but to a particular understanding of rank—place and status—within it. Rader persuasively places an individual sometimes dismissed as an eccentric into a meaningful explanatory context.

Like all anthologies, this one lacks the exhaustiveness of a successful monograph. But its virtues include the high quality of each essay and the chance to sample different methodological approaches that able scholars have brought to the study of American baseball.

Kansas State University

Donald J. Mrozek


As a media studies scholar, business school professor, and former marketing executive, Mara Einstein brings a unique perspective to the study of American religion. Brands of Faith focuses upon the proliferation of religious marketing in the past twenty years. It suggests that more freedom to choose one’s religious vantage, combined with a greater availability of options proffered by media outlets, has created a contemporary situation in which faiths must pay attention to branding issues like all other commodities. Throughout, the author keenly details the various negotiations necessary to market religion and thereby describes the “delicate dance” that must be done to “remain relevant while at the same time remaining true to one’s faith” (15).

Einstein includes many details regarding religious products in the publishing, television, and film industries. Texts such as Left Behind and The Purpose Driven Life and movies like the The Passion of the Christ and The Da Vinci Code are adroitly situated within their larger business environments and then dissected to reveal the marketing techniques that brought them to prominence. The early chapters offer a refreshing approach through seriously engaging many cultural texts that some might write off as too popular to be
academically relevant. Avoiding such pretense, Einstein analyzes religious commodities in a manner that reflects their pervasiveness, and thus import, in American culture.

Einstein takes aforementioned market successes one step further to demonstrate how such products often attract people to and even change the internal dynamics of American megachurches. Such organizations then tend to more thoroughly focus on their own “consumer appeal” in light of the spectacular success of these products. Her analysis of the “brand messages” associated with Rick Warren and Joel Osteen reveals the nuanced use of books, television programs, direct mail, and other devices to sell products, while simultaneously making their home churches and themselves into a desirable “brand.”

In her final chapters, Einstein sometimes adopts a polemical tone that is out of step with her earlier careful and data-filled observations. For instance, an examination of Kabbalah describes its various money-making practices as “blatant consumerism” with little regard for the true needs of spiritual seekers. Subsequent coverage of the political role of faith brands criticizes ways in which megachurches elide their conservative agendas because they believe that these vantages will drive away potential congregants. According to Einstein, pastors like Rick Warren are being disingenuous when claiming to be non-political in approach and use marketing techniques that elide distinct ideologies.

In the final chapter, Einstein offers her primary criticism of religious branding. As faith increasingly becomes a commodity like all others and as groups struggle with each other for members, religion has changed from “what people need to what people want” (192). Harkening upon social gospel approaches, Einstein decries a mounting inability to censure the machinations of capitalism or more generally speak to life’s problems. Many of the most popular faith brands are now so thoroughly embedded within a market approach prefaced on positive messages that they offer overly facile solutions to tribulations or avoid them all together. Ultimately, Brands of Faith is a welcome addition to the larger body of work on religion and consumer culture. Because of Einstein’s business acumen, she offers a perspective unavailable to most religion scholars. Although she lists in a contentious direction at times, the book is nevertheless a lively read that will enlighten those looking for an interpretive lens through which to view the spectacular success of contemporary religious commodities.

University of Kansas

Aaron K. Ketchell


This is an impressive piece of scholarship, which combines admirable bibliographical and archival research with clear, engaging prose. Throughout the book’s five main chapters, Schreiber painstakingly reconstructs the biographical and artistic trajectories of a talented and diverse group of progressive cultural workers who, in the heat of the Cold War-induced witchhunts, sought political and creative refuge in Mexico.

The first chapter offers an overview of the establishment of communities of US exiles in Mexico in the late 40s and early 50s. Chapter Two tells the fascinating story of a group of left-wing African American artists who were drawn to Mexico by the prominence and excellence of that country’s public art, in particular its printmaking and muralism. The third chapter analyzes the collaboration of blacklisted screenwriter Hugo Butler and Spanish Civil War exile Luis Buñuel on a film version of Robinson Crusoe, and the Gordon Kahn bildungsroman, A Long Way from Home, which tells the story of a young Mexican-American who dodges the Korean War draft by fleeing to Mexico. Chapter Four looks at three films written by Hollywood blacklistees exiled in Mexico:
two bullfighting films—Hugo Butler’s ¡Torero! (also produced in collaboration with Spanish exiles for a Mexican audience) and Dalton Trumbo’s The Brave One (produced in and for the US)—as well as Butler’s Los pequeños gigantes, which explores racism in Mexico and the US by telling the story of Little League baseball team from Mexico that won the Little League World Series of 1957. Chapter Five focuses on the writings of the African American exile Willard Motley, in particular his explorations of the intersection of racism, imperialism and tourism in Mexico in late 50s and early 60s.

The readings of individual texts may be, on occasion, somewhat disappointing, particularly when Schreiber falls back on more or less predictable observations of how the author or text in question subverts or challenges the conventions of this or that genre or cultural formation (e.g., “tourism writing,” or the “Hollywood screenplay” or “Mexico’s Golden Age of Cinema.”) But this possible shortcoming is more than made up for in the truly admirable reconstruction of the conditions of production and circulation (or, in many cases, non-circulation) of the texts in question. Perhaps another way to say the same thing: for this reader at least, the reconstruction of the drama of these real-life victims of the racial and ideological strife of the Cold War can at times seem more compelling—and maybe even more instructive—than the analyses of the cultural production of those victims.

Over the last decade or so, a good deal of lip service has been paid to the need to internationalize the fields of American Studies and American History. Cold War Exiles strikes me as an exemplary and “normalized” contribution to that worthy effort. This is pathbreaking work, based on a vast amount of archival and library research, which adopts interdisciplinary and international perspectives not to call attention to the author’s credentials or cleverness, but rather because the object of study—US culture during the Cold War—demands such an approach.

New York University

James D. Fernández


Marc Lee Raphael has ambitious goals for this collection. He aims to capture the tension between religious and secular identities in the Jewish community (5), as well as the centrality of the relationships among Jewishness, Judaism, and Americanness for Jewish individuals (6). Is the history of American Jews to be told as a narrative of assimilation and declining religiosity? Of diminishing anti-Semitism and rapid social mobility? Of political consensus or increasing internal division? Raphael’s contributors engage each of these themes. Because the book is organized first by chronology (the book’s first six essays) and then by topic (the final twelve essays), it attempts to avoid one of the most troubling tendencies of U.S. Jewish history: to provide a singular narrative arc to the American Jewish experience that follows religious Jewish life and Zionism while marginalizing all other expressions of Jewishness.

The chronological essays offer useful synthetic introductions. Brief biographies of leaders and laypeople alike appear in these pages, along with discussions of suburbanization, the Nazi Holocaust, synagogue and Jewish organizational growth and decline. Even for well-read scholars of this history, there are surprise facts: Eli Faber, for example, tells us that despite much anti-Semitic exclusion, Jews could be city constables in eighteenth-century New York City (36).

There are also missed opportunities where the collection does not break out of the paradigm of a singular narrative arc, presenting a narrow reading of Jewishness. Riv-Ellen Prell, for example, proposes that the attacks on Israel in 1967 brought about a “new Ameri-
can Jewish consensus... that placed Israel and Jerusalem at the center of American Jewish life” (137). Though there is ample material here on Jewish contributions to American Communism and other radical movements, Prell fails to mention Jewish anti-Zionism as existing outside of this so-called “consensus.” This is a glaring omission, especially since the work of Michael Staub (some of which thankfully appears here as a topical essay) has carefully documented crucial “dissenting perspectives” in the cold war era (325). A few pages later Stephen Whitfield discusses the topic of postwar anti-Semitism among African Americans, calling it the “only—and most glaring—exception to the trend (of declining American anti-Semitism)” (144). Again, the glaring absence is of a richer contextual discussion: of Jewish racism and contributions to white supremacist oppression, and too the impact of Third World Solidarity with Palestinians among African Americans. These omissions carry with them their own conservative agenda: in reading back into history a consensus on complicated issues, one stemming from a religious and Zionist brand of Jewishness, those forwarding this agenda see only one set of Jewish values and identity worth perpetuating in contemporary American Jewish life. The invisibility of dissenting perspectives continues to shape a false sense of consensus among American Jews.

In documenting some of the internal debates of American Jews, the topical essays—especially Staub’s—offer other narratives and perspectives. Melissa Klapper writes of the vociferous postwar debates over the Orthodox Jewish day school movement and offers an interesting window onto internal divisions among American Jews: non-Orthodox Jews pledged loyalty to public education while “indictments of ghettoization and assimilation” were offered by both sides (209). William Toll and Mark Bauman provide two welcome essays that depart the East Coast and look at varieties of Jewish life along the Pacific and in the American South.

American Studies scholars may lament the general lack of material on American Jews’ interactions with other cultural groups, and also on cultural representations of Jewishness. Jeffrey Shandler’s promising title “What is American Jewish Culture?” yields a brief, disappointing study of how this culture has been studied. Linda Raphael’s concluding essay is the only one dedicated to analyzing representations of Jewishness, yet she offers only a recitation of well-trod readings of the conservative canon of American Jewish literature: Cahan, Yezierska, Roth and Ozick. Ultimately, despite its ambitious title and introduction, Raphael’s collection rarely strays from the old, parochial paradigms of American Jewish History. Those searching for the most forward-looking work in this area—that being done at the intersections of Jewish, American, and cultural studies—will find only a small amount of satisfying material here.

Babson College

Marjorie N. Feld


In this ambitious intellectual study, Amy Laura Hall tackles the historical tensions between Protestantism and science in the realm of reproduction. Her focus is on the fraught relationship between religion, science, and consumer culture, questioning why twentieth-century white middle-class American families welcomed rather than resisted an ethic of parenthood that differentiates between the “wanted” and the “unwanted.” Buying into the consumer ethic of progress, these families implicitly rejected the moral basis of their religion and its emphasis on redemption. Perhaps more surprisingly, they were guided into this ethic of progress by the church itself, beginning in the mid-twentieth century. Ministers stressed that Christian couples were “morally obligated to plan” their families
in order to strengthen the community (13). Hall contrasts this religious promotion of a controlled, planned, ideal (white, middle-class) family with the model of irresponsible, unhealthy, out-of-control (non-white, poor) family denigrated by eugenicists, advertisers, and others. With this increasingly visible and pronounced dichotomy of good vs. bad, healthy vs. unhealthy, productive vs. dependent family types, it is not surprising that so many religious consumers bought into this notion that their own families should adhere to a particular size and standard.

Hall mines Christian journals, sermons, hymns, popular magazines, and eugenics archives to present a multi-dimensional portrait of prescriptive parenthood. Perhaps most interesting and entertaining of the many images included in her book are advertisements urging mothers to consider science and technology in their parenting decisions, whether it is for Lysol, baby formula, televisions, or ADHD medications. Such variety, however, also serves to weaken her argument. Hall finds prescriptive parenthood almost everywhere, and at times her book resembles a catalog of promotional material rather than a historical analysis of parenthood or Protestantism. Part of the problem stems from a somewhat disjointed narrative, as Hall skips from 1950s Methodist magazines to twenty-first-century pharmaceutical campaigns for ADHD and back again without hesitation. One paragraph on the eugenics movement jumps from World War II to 1926 to 1968 and back to 1953, for example (283).

As a self-proclaimed pro-life feminist, minister, and professor of theological ethics, Hall is unabashed about the prescriptive nature of her work, hoping that it will help to reform mainline Protestantism. Families need to rethink conceptions of parenthood, she argues, in order to combat the efforts of those seeking to eliminate genetic “imperfections.” Her passion and concern spill out from the pages, which may inspire some readers to question the status quo. Her approach, however, obscures the complexities of twentieth-century reproductive history. There is little room for agency in her story (resisters to this prescriptive literature are limited to the book’s final pages) and little differentiation between ideas promoted by Nativist ministers in the 1890s, 1950s advertisers, and twenty-first-century scientists researching ADHD. Nevertheless, this is a thoughtful and provocative study on this history of procreation and parenthood in twentieth-century America.

University of Cincinnati
Wendy Kline


Because of rapid transitions taking place in the media landscape and the frequently changing fortunes of political parties, books about digital media and political life often become rapidly dated. Although Digital Media and Democracy: Tactics in Hard Times is very much a document of the Bush administration, many of the essays it contains continue to remain relevant by seeming to forecast trends that are only accelerating: the conglomeration of ownership in social computing, the corporatization of blogging, and the impending demise of print journalism. Unfortunately, not all the essays in this collection are as prescient. Many of the pieces are only tangentially related to the “digital media” promised in the title. Lengthy interviews with Amy Goodman, Deepa Fernandes, and Hassan Ibrahim are largely devoted to conventional broadcast models, and essays by Susan Moeller and Chris Atton ground their arguments about mainstream media and alternative media respectively largely through analysis of the traditional practices of news producers and newspaper editors.
Nonetheless, this volume is worthwhile for new media scholars because it provides a variety of substantive counterarguments to the optimistic equation of Internet access with democratic enlightenment, which has become associated with paradigms of “collective intelligence” from Pierre Lévy and “participatory culture” from Henry Jenkins. Several authors in the collection point to the influences of capitalism, militarism, and nationalism at work in online politics. Furthermore, given the importance of tactical media for contemporary European net theory, the essays that address tactical media directly apply frameworks for art and activism abroad to U.S. contexts and explicate large-scale patterns of news consumption and viral events. To introduce the subject, Allesandra Renzi provides an excellent overview of the principles of tactical media and how such media exploit, appropriate, and sabotage the resources of strategically oriented mainstream media. An essay by Trebor Scholz captures the inventiveness of many tactical media interventions, which include using ring tones and closed captioning to make political statements intended to foster discussion. There are also a number of interesting critiques from within tactical media of its more utopian assumptions, including reflections about the limitations of “sovereign media” by Geert Lovink in an interview. Graham Meikle also acknowledges that tactical media can fail to have obvious political influence, particularly if “play” is devalued by fellow activists in the interest of “work.” Finally, R. Sophie Statzel’s study of the websites of white supremacists argues that those who use tactical media do not necessarily support democracy or liberation politics. One of the frequent touchstones of the book is Jodi Dean’s central essay in the collection, “Communicative Capitalism: Circulation and the Foreclosure of Politics,” which argues that discourse on the Internet has become dominated by exchange value and not use value and that fantasies of abundance, participation, and wholeness blind Internet users to obstacles to political change. Readers familiar with Dean and Lovink’s *Reformatting Politics: Information Technology and Civil Society* will not only see more American case studies but also more engagement with analysis of satire; unfortunately these same readers may also notice the occasionally obtrusive editorial presence of Megan Boler when comparing these two books.

University of California, Irvine

Elizabeth Losh


At a time when historians seem determined to produce monster volumes, Eric Rauchway has courageously undertaken a major challenge. He has squeezed into a slim pocket size volume an analytical account of one of the most complex and widely debated periods in modern US history. He writes about the Great Depression and the New Deal era with great skill and understanding. In doing so he delivers an excellent introduction to a time of serious economic crisis and the response of government to it. This troubled decade has caught the attention of a public reeling from the shock of the current economic and financial malaise. Anyone who wants a full understanding of the last great crisis should start by reading this perceptive study.

Rauchway begins with an investigation of the causes of the downturn which began in 1929. He rightly emphasises the potentially destabilizing level of international and domestic indebtedness during the 1920s and does not neglect the vital role that US foreign trade and lending played in the international economy. It is ironic that Herbert Hoover was forced to confront the disintegration of a seemingly powerful economy. Hoover was intelligent, industrious and had a greater understanding of the work of contemporary economists than any other twentieth century president. He was not unconcerned, nor was
he inactive. Rauchway is probably too critical of Hoover’s economic management, but he is clear in his account of crucial Federal Reserve interventions.

Hoover was too wedded to economic orthodoxy and had too little political warmth to salvage himself or his party in 1932. Roosevelt knew no economics, but he was prepared to embrace new ideas and cast off orthodoxy in both the economic and social spheres. FDR, for example, was sympathetic to plans for reflation, especially of farm prices. He was prepared to fund initiatives to help the “forgotten man” and, in an act which horrified conservatives but was consistent with a policy of raising prices, the gold standard was abandoned in 1933. However, Roosevelt never embraced the more radical policies espoused in Congress and by pundits everywhere. He wanted to save capitalism, not destroy it. He was concerned that reflation might become inflation, he disliked the persistent budget deficits that his costly programs caused and he was not in favour of the federal insurance of bank deposits. He, and other New Dealers, worried about welfare dependency. Consequently they supported work relief over dole payments, and those fortunate to secure a place on projects had to satisfy social workers that they were not merely out of work but also destitute. What was radical, however, was the historically colossal amount of public funding which became available to support a wide range of relief and recovery agencies. The book concludes with a well-chosen bibliography and a helpful table listing all relevant federal acts, together with a short description of them.

It is astonishing how much information Rauchway has provided without sacrificing clarity. Unlike many of Roosevelt’s critics, he places the New Deal firmly in its historical context. This sympathetic account will strike a chord, particularly with those who have become disillusioned with deregulation as a cure for all economic ills, and also with the view that markets always clear satisfactorily. However, all readers will appreciate his astute judgement and masterful handling of the evidence.

University of Leicester (United Kingdom)

Peter Fearon


“Have western cities been different from eastern North America?” (274) asks Carl Abbott in the conclusion of his near-encyclopedic survey of urban development west of the Mississippi River in the United States and in western Canada from the seventeenth century to the present. The answer, of course, is yes. Yet Abbott also demonstrates that western cities, large and small, were different from each other. There were coastal commercial centers established in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries for trade along major waterways and across the Pacific. “Some nineteenth-century cities,” he writes, “were gateways between the West and the world” (4). For others, urban growth hinged on rail lines, mineral mining, military garrisons or, as was the case with Denver and Kansas City, vocal and effective boosters. By the early twentieth century, cities depended on controlling irrigation systems, on tourism and later on global knowledge-based industries. That diversity is the book’s weakness and its strength. The widely varied histories of western cities leave How Cities Won the West without an overarching narrative; the book frequently seems like a string of fascinating anecdotes sewn together. Yet that steady buildup of facts and figures in a loose and lively style underscores the book’s central argument: commercial centers—some hardly cities by today’s standards—were crucial to the economic and political growth of that mythic place Americans call “the west.”

The image of a western frontier fashioned in fiction and film as a vast open space conquered by courageous white men was long ago shattered by scholars of environmental,
Native American, and western history. Abbot’s study further wrecks the frontier myth. European settlers, he demonstrates, planted commercial centers across the continent, and were followed quickly by entrepreneurs seeking to profit from the west’s agricultural and mineral wealth. “Urban history as frontier history,” he notes, “deals… with the full incorporation of the west into the system of modern capitalism” (33). Most significantly, cities were hardly accidents of nature. “No one knew which small settlement was going to grow into another Paris or which California mission would be a seed for another Rome” (34). Rather, cities grew while competing for rail lines, irrigation systems, eastern capital, and settlers. By the late nineteenth century, newer cities like Spokane, Calgary and El Paso were outpacing the older regional centers like Salt Lake City. With mining and manufacturing came labor strife and conflicts between white, Mexican and Asian immigrants. Each city’s economic base determined its growth pattern as well as the racial, ethnic and class conflicts that crystallized in the twentieth century.

Politics too was crucial. Abbott traces shifts in urban coalitions as nineteenth-century boosters were replaced by Progressive reformers, while in places like Houston, Dallas, and Portland a “radical middle class” (141) of small property-owners and proprietors united with skilled workers and American socialists until World War I. By the late twentieth century, powerful new coalitions, often neighborhood-based and often rooted in the experiences of the Civil Rights Movement, emerged. This “politics of diversity” (205), reacting to mid-century urban renewal and racial segregation, transformed urban centers in San Antonio and Portland.

How Cities Won the West, with its vivid detail and broad scope, its synthesis of scholarship and numerous quotations from great western novels and poetry, is a useful reference work on that no-longer-mythic place. Washington University in St. Louis


In the American post civil rights period, tolerance and diversity are the measures of our national commitment to social equality. We acknowledge (and sometimes celebrate) diversity and differences of all sorts, including even racial difference. We are, however, constituted as citizen-subjects in a polity where the formal terms of citizenship, belonging, and recognition require civic and national allegiance to the nation-state. The histories and experiences of subjugation that such differences (especially blackness) structure and the oppositional politics they inspire cannot exceed the limits of the modern state. In his engaging and compelling new book, In Search of the Black Fantastic, Richard Iton charts the social movements, intellectual discourses, cultural practices, and institutional forms that circumscribe (even as they acknowledge) black subjectivity in the post civil rights black Atlantic Diaspora.

For a blackness constructed and circumscribed within the horizon of formal politics and nation-states, the cultural fantasy (expressed in black popular culture) that imagines an alternative blackness is the other of the national formation and the excess of the citizenship. This black excess, that is not easily contained and is therefore marked or expelled, is Iton’s focus and for him the source of the black radical possibilities. Iton’s bet is that if we pay attention to the rich history and clues that popular culture provides to this fantastic imagination, we will learn to see, hear, and feel a distinct radical and political tradition through the register of culture. Showing how culture moves through the political (and vice versa) means too that new possibilities are within our horizon. Iton is also interested
in those expressions of the black popular imaginary that helped to narrate and align black futures with those of the neo-liberal and nationalist state through appeals for recognition and inclusion.

Iton reworks concepts like Diaspora and uses it to see modern forms of power like coloniality, modernity, and nation-state anew. Iton eschews the widely accepted notion of Diaspora that emphasizes resettlement and roots, stressing instead multiple temporalities and local connections within and across the black Diaspora; in the process he shows how cultural narratives of the nation and the formal terms of the state together conceal and re-inscribe the unequal relations and access to freedom, citizenship and equality. With popular culture as his guide Iton rethinks geographical space (and scale) and the kind of black Atlantic histories, intertextual connections, and affective registers it is possible to experience outside of the discourse of the nation and the formal terms of the state.

His nuanced reading of history builds an argument about the radical promise of black Atlantic popular culture, beginning in the period just prior to the civil rights movement. Iton traces some of the earliest expressions of a black fantastic imagination to black engagement with the popular front politics of Paul Robeson, Harry Belafonte, Ossie Davis and later Lorraine Hansberry. For Iton popular culture’s political importance lies in its role in creating a space—what he calls a black super public—for black radical imagination in the post civil rights period. He offers a useful account of how (technology of representation, the increasing salience of the image, unlimited access to the archive and the mobility of sound) and why (the subjection of black politics to the formal rules and aspirations of the nation-state) this register emerged as important for black Atlantic diasporic politics in the post civil rights period. The black fantastic constitutes this space and serves as a hedge against hegemonies of nation-time and nostalgia and articulates new forms of connection and alliance within and across black diasporic communities expressed in the work of Richard Pryor, Me’Shell NdegéOcello, Bob Marley and others.

Iton deploys theory, history, and details about a staggering range of cultural forms, practices and traditions brilliantly! His grasp of cultural movements, practices, artists and representations in black Atlantic popular culture is impressive, as is his strategic use of cultural and political theory. His magnificent descriptions and interpretations convey the very diasporic sensibility—borrowing, encounter, multiple temporalities, new geographies, instability, and unsettlement—that he argues for. Iton believes passionately in the capacity of the black fantastic to redraw and reshape the geographic, social, and spatial relations of blackness—what it means to be black, how, where and with whom. In this important and deeply rewarding book, Iton provokes readers to see, hear, and feel just as deeply about black popular culture and politics.

University of California, Santa Cruz
Herman Gray


Jews have long occupied a curious place in the collective imagination of American Studies. While scholars consistently invoke Jewish images and influences as defining elements of modern American culture, they all too frequently insist on viewing Jewish identity solely in terms of its relationship to the black-white racial dichotomy, ignoring its own unique fusion of ethnic, religious, and national dimensions. In Klezmer America, Jonathan Freedman’s welcome new study, he confronts this problem directly and offers a solution in the form of an ambitious, impassioned call for a revival of the study of Jewish ethnicity in American culture.
Freedman makes his case through a virtuoso set of peregrinations through the works of writers such as Tony Kushner, Philip Roth, and Arthur Miller, along with briefer, highly suggestive excursions into the Jewish-Latino, Jewish-Asian American, and even Jewish-Evangelical Christian nexus in contemporary fiction. He selects music as his linking motif for these case studies, highlighting the hybrid, destabilizing force of klezmer music in contemporary Jewish and American culture. From its early modern East European folk origins, klezmer dramatically morphed in late twentieth-century America into a creative vehicle for a loose movement of musicians who frequently collapse the lines between high and low, black and white, Jewish and non-Jewish, synagogue and jazz club. Freedman sees this contemporary klezmer—multicultural and avant-garde, yet rooted in Jewish tradition—as a neat expression of Jewish-American creativity as a whole. It is one that substitutes postmodern “affinity” for more rigid notions of cultural ownership or national heritage, let alone the rigidity of race.

Freedman’s book is an enjoyable mixture of literary criticism and genuine cultural sleuthing into the Jewish-American past. Building on the work of the newer Jewish Cultural Studies, he convincingly demonstrates how, one way or another, Jewishness forms a crucial counterpoint to various kinds of American ethnic identity. Ironically, though, the reader in search of a deeper account of the music referred to in the book’s title will come away frustrated by its casual, selective approach in this regard. Despite its present-day “relentless hybridity,” for most of the twentieth century, American klezmer was neither a modernist cultural movement nor a multicultural mélange, but an immigrant ethnic folk music. Indeed, one of the enduring mysteries of Jewish-American cultural history is why this music failed to undergo the great mid-century cultural mainstreaming that took place for literature. Freedman does not ask, for instance, why Sholem Aleichem’s Yiddish stories found new life as Broadway’s Fiddler on the Roof, the ultimate symbol of post-Holocaust Jewish-American identity, yet most American Jews abandoned klezmer until the 1990s. So too is the story of this musical decline and reemergence a more complex tale than Freedman’s politicized reading of it as the sound of “rootless cosmopolitanism,” “queer diasporism,” and “cultural syncretism.” Rather than a progressive Jewish rejection of ethnic essentialism, klezmer’s contemporary boom might just as easily be understood as a post-Civil Rights era re-ethnicization (and re-Europeanization) of Jewish identity at the very point when American urban ethnicity had seemingly reached its nadir.

This criticism aside, Freedman’s book offers scintillating readings of an impressive array of texts and a valuable, provocative challenge to scholars who reduce modern Jewish artists to cultural appropriators, wannabe blacks, or would-be WASPs. Most importantly, his convincing redeployment of the frame of Jewish ethnicity in studying American culture should inspire others to follow in his footsteps.

University of Virginia

James Loeffler


According to standard accounts of country music’s development, women played a minor part in the 1930-40s. They cite the prejudices against women performing on stage and traveling unaccompanied with men. They say that for women to have a chance, they performed as part of family aggregations or with their husband and his band. The prejudices were all too real, but many women had opportunities to perform as part of a barn dance show’s ‘family’ cast. Scholars have generally seen these women as ‘window dressing,’ unimportant to the development of country music. Confronting this view, Mc-
Cusker convincingly shows that women not only appeared on barn-dance radio, but they played a significant role in shaping the country music Zeitgeist.

McCusker makes her case by following the careers of seven barn-dance radio women as revealed by their biographical material, the correspondence of the managers who shaped the women’s image and career back-story, transcriptions of the broadcasts, radio station fan-oriented publicity, and published fan comments.

A juvenile delinquent and bar singer, twenty-year-old Jeanne Munch was the prototypical female barn-dance performer. She was invited by John Lair to join Chicago’s National Barn Dance in 1932. He changed her name to Linda Parker, “The Little Sunbonnet Girl,” and her hometown from industrial Hammond, Indiana to rural Kentucky. To complete the picture, Lair coached her to be cheerful, optimistic, and perky, a coy hillbilly ingénue.

Linda Parker’s fabricated character was drawn from the Vaudeville tradition where actors performed stock stereotypical characters, but the intimate conversational tone fostered by radio technology made it possible to suffuse the character with more individuality and sympathetic humanity than had been possible on stage. Accordingly the best of these performers, like Linda Parker, became stars with many loyal fans.

Not content to develop appealing characters, John Lair and other managers, with the support of advertisers, focused on the moral tone of the programming. Their introductory dialogues, the songs chosen, and skits extolling the sanctity of the home, tradition and self-sacrificing motherhood were aimed at assuaging the hardships of the Great Depression and the sacrifices of World War II.

When Parker died suddenly at 23, there was an upwelling of fan grief that astounded the radio business, and the search was on for young women who could be shaped into the moral ingénue mode. McCusker details the lives of six successors who further developed the image of the leading Barn Dance female performer. Four of these were influenced by John Lair: Lulu Bell Wiseman, the most wildly popular of them all, Molly and Dolly Good — Girls of the Golden West, and Lilly May Ledford, who actually hailed from the Kentucky mountains. Rose Lee Maphis was able to make a steady career when she paired with her guitarist-manager husband, Joe Maphis. Sarah Colley Cannon came from a wealthy small town Tennessee family and attended finishing school. She needed no guiding manager to navigate the many traps that McCusker shows were faced by every female performer. Instead she crafted the “Minnie Pearl” character and deflected sexual innuendos by making a comedic prop of her plain looks and adopted a nurturing motherly role off stage.

Scholars and fans alike will find this an essential resource on women’s important role in developing country music.

Vanderbilt University

Richard A. Peterson


In Men, Mobs, and Law, Rebecca N. Hill presents a comprehensive, comparative analysis of labor-defense campaigns and anti-lynching campaigns. Both “were intimately related and have influenced each other substantially.” Similarly, they “have worked primarily through appeals to public opinion in the media, used stories of terror and heroism to build alliances across lines of class and race, and have been formative in the creation of radical political identities” (2).
Mob violence has a long history in America. Many have viewed these incidents through the prism of race. As Hill explains, politicians, police, and citizens tended to see white rebellious crowds more as regulatory than revolutionary. White rioting “was defined by the will to fight for one’s rights” (35). African-American rebels, however, were considered unmanly beasts that had no legitimate cause to engage in violence. Hill utilizes the story of John Brown as a telling example of not only how white rebels were held to a different standard, but also how cultural understandings were beginning to change in the nineteenth century. Brown’s “legend followed the tropes of the Great Man,” but the defense campaign for the Haymarket Martyrs which followed “introduced the concept of the executed men as fallen heroes in the class war.” It was the duty of “the passionate masses to save them” (69). Additionally and significantly, some who defended the Haymarket Martyrs offered an analysis and social critique that linked the concepts of race and class. Nonetheless, as Hill demonstrates, it took decades before radicals in the labor movement and activists in the anti-lynching campaign began to solidify the connections between them. That happened clearly during the Red Scare after the First World War and gained momentum during the cases of Bartolomeo Vanzetti and Nicola Sacco, the Scottsboro Nine, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, and George Jackson. Often the alliances between radicals, progressives, and liberals took the form of various defense organizations such as the Industrial Workers of the World’s General Defense Committee or the Communists’ International Labor Defense or Soledad Brothers Defense Committee. These organizations were short-lived and fraught with contentious divisions. Nonetheless, the defense campaigns made significant advances in civil rights, labor rights, and other social endeavors such as the prison reform movement.

*Men, Mobs, and Law* is an important book that cuts across traditional lines of inquiry and analysis. Hill is to be commended for her creative use of historical evidence as well as cultural sources, including poems, novels, autobiographies, plays, and songs. Also impressive are her abilities to relate her topics to international issues and movements as well as to engage in theoretical and historiographical debates. Despite some minor factual errors (e.g., the famous Kidd case in Oshkosh, Wisconsin, happened in 1898, not 1903 [136]), the book makes a strong contribution to the study of American radicalism, the labor movement, the civil rights movement, and the law.

University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

Andrew E. Kersten


The measure (and evaluation) of cultural change is one of the most difficult tasks of the historian. This is doubly so when the subject is contemporary society where underlying trends are often confused by a blur of conflicting directions, but where superficial certainties abound, the stuff of journalistic proclamations, forgotten almost as soon as they are enunciated. There is no doubt that Gary Cross is aware of these pitfalls in his new book on masculinity crisis: *Men to Boys*. There is also no mistaking his point: the modern male is in full flight from maturity and responsibility, pursuing the dream of an eternal boyhood in his attitudes, avoidance of responsibility, cultural interests and hobbies, and relationships with other men and women. Mixing personal observation and autobiography with sociological measures, journalistic accounts, and, most extensively, a reading of television shows and films, toys and computer games, Cross skewers the irresponsibility and immaturity of his generation and their sons.
This is not entirely new. Other observers like Michael Kimmel and Susan Faludi have made similar arguments, but Cross’s contribution lies in his reading of popular culture and his invocation of generational history. In a larger sense it might be argued that this work is a commentary on the theme of much of his other scholarship: the growth, development and implications of modern consumer culture. Generational terminology—The Greatest Generation, Baby Boomers, Generation X, Generation Y, the Me-Generation, and the Pepsi Generation—constitute his organizational and theoretical tools, as he ascribes to each category specific qualities of mood, style and character. These are solely conceived as male attributes, and we do not know if women shared or share the same cultural attitudes. Anchoring his critique is his affirmation of a more traditional male maturity, defined by responsibility, work, family, very like the Victorian model without the cold, emotionless, patriarchal defaults.

There is certainly evidence to support Cross’s contention that modern masculinity has changed and that popular culture—or at least some aspects of it—reflect his notion of the “boy-man,” perpetually frozen in a pursuit of youth. And it is admirable when an author risks autobiography to make his points. But I am not yet convinced that he has made his case. Clearly something has changed, but is it as he describes it, or more important, as he judges it? The problem, I think, rests in three places. The first is in holding up the “traditional” family (242), with a breadwinner father and housewife mother. Traditional for whom? Maybe the middle class family in the late 19th century into the 1950s. But in many, many cases throughout American history, the tradition is much more complex, with women working in agriculture, factories, and secretarial positions. The second problem is the use of generation as a historical category. Such terms are vague, imprecise, inconclusive, and too universal, obscuring very important distinctions of social class, gender (especially here), and race. Finally, there is an assumption about popular culture that requires justification. Is it the case, as it seems here, that the author’s selective reading of TV shows, films, and novels, can be taken as a valid description of what the audience “got” either consciously or unconsciously? Are we the stereotypes presented in popular culture?

Certainly this is an interesting read, and Cross’s obvious uneasiness with the direction of American consumer culture makes an interesting and lively evaluation. Perhaps men have become boys. But maybe we need to wait longer and dig deeper to know the meaning of the changes that Cross finds.

University of Maryland

James Gilbert


Liberal progressives need no reminder that the US-Mexico border has been the scene over the last fifteen years of brutal violence against young women in Ciudad Juárez, Mexico and heat stroke in Arizona’s deserts for Mexican laborers seeking work in the United States. These episodes in human tragedy (and precursors from earlier decades) provide the moral impetus for Alicia Schmidt Camacho’s study of the “migrant imaginary,” those social aspirations and ideals of justice that migrants and their defenders have developed as a counterweight to the economic imperatives that have forced their movement into the United States. In five chapters, Part One of her book analyzes the ethical defense of migrant Mexicans constructed by the canonical scholar-activists of the borderlands between 1920 and 1965, including Americo Paredes, Emma Tenayuca, Luisa Moreno, and Ernesto Galarza. Part Two brings those concerns closer to the last decades of the twentieth
century, exploring the exploitation of female labor in the Juarez maquila industry in one chapter and the narratives of loss that contemporary migrants have recorded during their transit to the United States in another.

In Schmidt’s Marxian analysis, Mexican migrants have been locked in an international capitalist economy that has exploited their labor for more than 100 years without the delivery of democratic rights and social welfare from the US and Mexican states. In this model, the state has been the tool of capitalist whites whose racist assumptions have created a diaspora of Mexico-descended peoples who are not allowed to share in the privileges of liberal citizenship. Amid these repressive structures, however, Schmidt argues that migrant sojourners and their intellectual patrons have challenged capitalist subordination across the breadth of the twentieth century. Communist sympathizers Emma Tenayuca and Luisa Moreno used the international labor movement to challenge Mexican subordination during the 1930s. Folklorist Americo Paredes constructed bilingual narratives in the 1940s and 50s whose dual signifiers subverted the confines of the nation-state. Post-NAFTA feminist activism in El Paso, Texas has brought attention to globalization processes that have reduced immigrant women to an expendable labor force stretching across the US and Mexico. A single feature unites the moral visions manifested in these critiques of the capitalist order, Schmidt argues. Whether expressed in 1930s Marxist theory, the universal language of the postwar civil rights movement, or current discourses of globalization, those critiques were all premised on the inherent unity of a binational bloc of Mexico-descended people. Moreover, by consistently subordinating the conventions of the nation-state to the larger geographic and moral visions of an international constituency of laborers, migrants from Mexico have played a central role in exposing the limitations and contradictions of the nation-state in North America.

Schmidt’s attention to social theory in Mexico represents a step forward in analysis that is usually centered on the United States alone. Even more impressive is her analysis of women as trade unionists, laborers, and political theorists who made fundamental contributions to liberation struggles that are usually understood as a history of men. Her use of novels, films, ethnography, intellectual history, and literary criticism also makes this one of the richest methodological texts I have ever read. Ultimately, however, these strengths do not respond to the weaknesses of the argument. First, although Schmidt has set out to chart the oppositional ideals of justice crafted by immigrant laborers, there are few migrant voices in the text. Americo Paredes and Emma Tenayuca—both US born—defended an international diaspora of people across the US and Mexico, but Schmidt presents little evidence that migrant sojourners created ethical worlds that were equivalent to the ones crafted by these border intellectuals. Even when border intellectuals had themselves migrated into the United States, as in the case of Luisa Moreno or Ernesto Galarza, Schmidt does not suggest why their visions of justice adequately represented the ideals of the hundreds of thousands who were simultaneously flowing northward. Mexico’s people crafted wondrous moral universes across the 19th and 20th centuries, as Paul Vanderwood’s Tomochic rebels, Luis Gonzalez’s braceros, Julie Purnell’s agraristas, Fernando Benitez’s teachers, Michael Snodgrass’s proletarian, and Mario Suarez’s petit bourgeois have shown us. Yet none of the moral systems of these communities fits either the international vision of justice or the cross-national diaspora that Schmidt would have us believe is the essential characteristic of Mexico’s migrants. The second weakness concerns her totalizing argument. Here, the state functions only as a tool of control and never as an instrument of liberation. This is a fine position in Marxist theory, but the history of twentieth-century reform movements depended on state structures for the expansion of democratic rights as much as it did on the political
mobilization of their Mexico-descended communities. The Wagner Act, the US federal courts, the GI Bill, and the Great Society were each fundamental to migrant social mobility, yet Schmidt’s Marxian approach makes a more ambiguous role for the state impossible. In Mexico, meanwhile, the federal government channeled resources to a wide range of regional communities that created worker support for the postrevolutionary state. In view of these important weaknesses, Schmidt’s book is better seen as the latest installment in the radical critique of capital rather than as a history of migrant subjectivity. There is no reason in principle why those two cannot converge, but more empirical investigation is needed here to sustain the theoretical argument that Schmidt has constructed.

University of Kansas

Ruben Flores


Gabrielle Esperdy, an architect on the faculty of the New Jersey Institute of Technology, has produced a true gem of a book, one exceptionally well written, and one exceptionally well researched. The book deals with an important topic heretofore largely overlooked by scholars—the Roosevelt Administration’s depression-fighting, economic pump-priming programs to upgrade retail business districts through storefront modernization. But the book does more. It carefully places in historical context that modernization effort vis-a-vis all the other changes coming to “Main Street” America during the 1930s, especially the automobile’s impact on landscape and place. The book has broad reach both as an architectural history and as a social history. It will remain an authoritative voice for many years to come.

The book contains a short introduction followed by six chapters, each of which is fully self-standing, and yet carefully linked in persuasive lines of argumentation anchored by insightful conclusions. All are sustained through the author’s careful reading of a broad secondary literature (including period trade journals), but, most importantly, through careful use of selected archival materials, including federal documents (especially those the Federal Housing Administration and various housing and home finance agencies) and corporate records.

Chapter One (“Main Street, U.S.A”) sketches the rise of American central business districts through the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the new competition they faced from outlying business districts, especially the new auto-oriented commercial strips aborning in the 1930s. Emphasis is placed on retail chains and their embrace of “modern” architectural styling in storefront design, something which stood in contrast to older design motifs, especially in traditional retail districts increasingly in decline and thus blighted. Chapter Two (“The New Deal on Main Street”) outlines the federal response, particularly through the 1934 National Housing Act and its Modernization Credit Plan that offered low-interest, federally insured loans to repair or improve business properties. Thus modernization “repositioned as a central building industry activity” (55). Chapter Three (“Marketing Modernization”) details the nationwide campaign to upgrade the nation’s “Main Streets,” one collectively orchestrated by government agencies, industry trade organizations, and individual corporations, especially the manufacturers of structural glass. Case studies focus on the activities of Pittsburgh Plate Glass (with its Carrara glass brand) and Libbey-Owens-Ford (with its Vitrolite brand). Influence of the International Style of European modernism was clearly at the forefront—storefronts with “flattened planes and poster-like facades, often highly colored, asymmetrical compositions with
strongly defined horizontals and verticals, curved bulkheads, and signage expressed in bold graphics with contemporary typefaces” (125).

Chapter Four (“The Architecture of Consumption”) provides the core of the book’s argument—discussion of planned obsolescence as a means of economic pump-priming (through what the author terms “facadism”) (163). Chapter Five (“Modernism on Main Street”) explores more the metaphorical implications of the packaged “modern” facade in creating a new “iconography of prosperity” (203). Although the work of specific designers (including Walter Teague and Raymond Lowe) and specific architects (including Walter Gropius and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe) is discussed, emphasis is actually placed on the rise of a new architectural “vernacular”—something rather anonymous in its creation. The word “vernacular,” the author writes, designates “widespread occurrence and everydayness” and a “hierarchical position at the low end of the architectural spectrum (219).” It is something fully commonplace. Chapter Six (“Conclusion: A Main Street Modernized”) offers synthesis by way of a case study focused on Reading, Pennsylvania. Discussion turns on today’s need to preserve surviving examples of 1930s retail modernism—what once symbolized a better future or, in the author’s terms, “an optimistic glimpse of a progressive tomorrow, one seemingly guaranteed by the machine-age luster of chrome, neon, and glass” (244).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

John A. Jakle


Celebrated as the ultimate, glacier-running mountain man who survived on stale bread, John Muir often stands in the popular imagination as the founder of environmental conservation, the national park system, and American nature writing. In this recent biography, noted environmental historian Donald Worster allows readers to revel in some of the tales that typically define his legendary subject: the painstaking recovery from the eye injury that left Muir temporarily blind and permanently filled with zest for seeing nature’s beauty, for example, and his traumatic childhood as the son of a religious zealot. Nonetheless, Worster makes here a signal contribution to American studies—first, by sharing the fruits of his expert research labors into Muir’s journal fragments, manuscripts, and letters, and, second, by nudging readers toward a realistic assessment of Muir’s contributions to the conversation movement.

Rather than presenting Muir to readers as the heralded father of environmentalism, Worster sensibly depicts him as merely an eager participant in a movement already well underway: “he added his voice to a conservation movement that in the post-Civil War era was emerging across the nation” (232). Similarly, Worster clarifies Muir’s legendary status: “others preceded him, others showed up at critical moments, and others contributed important ideas” (331). Worster also notes Muir’s marked disengagement from pressing environmental issues that were right under his nose, and he clearly hopes that readers will understand that Muir’s relationship to the natural world was one not only of worship but also of manipulation. Too often later admirers “would miss the significance of [Muir’s] years as a farmer whose goal was to reorder the earth’s resources” (277).

At his best, Worster creates a magisterial narrative out of seemingly inconsequential details. For example, Wordsworth’s 1803 pilgrimage to the grave of Robert Burns may appear to have little to do with Muir, who was not born until thirty-five years after the event, but in Worster’s hands this historic moment is about Muir, essential to understanding the Romantic thinking that shaped his belief in the spiritual elixir of nature. Worster also
traverses cultural history, incorporating into his discussion of Muir’s days such topics as the Civil War, the rise of science, the development of the transcontinental railroad, and the San Francisco earthquake of 1906. Yet Worster’s tendency to conceptualize grandly is also this volume’s weakness: the biography is characterized by a graceful—but sometimes troubling—economy of ideas. In explaining Muir’s rejection of the religious bigotry of his father, for example, Worster suggests that conservative evangelical Christianity stands in contrast to the “Romantic and democratic religion of nature” that Muir would come to embrace (68). As Worster undoubtedly well knows, however, this dichotomous pitting of evangelical Christianity against environmental appreciation grossly misrepresents the relationship between conservative Christianity and environmental history: much environmental destruction remains propelled by a complex conflation of Romantic ideals, democratic idealism, and evangelical Christianity.

*A Passion for Nature* nonetheless makes a welcome contribution by “mak[ing] Muir a more complicated figure in the [cultural] landscape than a simple lover of the wild” (277). Worster takes a figure of mythic proportions and, through historical contextualization and a prudent use of scholarship, brings him down to size.
The College of Idaho
Rochelle Johnson


This book is a jeremiad against mandated racial integration of schools. Raymond Wolters, a historian at the University of Delaware, states his overall position up front: “in terms of educational benefits, desegregation has been problematic, and integration a failure” (vii). Wolters reviews the tortuous history of court decisions, and his chief complaint throughout is that “the constitutional mandate was changed from prohibiting racial discrimination to separate the races to requiring racial discrimination to mix them” (137). As Wolters shows, the initial prohibition against official segregation floundered for two reasons. First, after an initial period of massive resistance, Southern states realized they could deftly circumvent the Brown decision by embracing the principle of “freedom of choice,” since few students of either race “chose” to attend schools that were predominantly of another race. Second, as desegregation “moved North,” the issue shifted from de jure to de facto segregation, and desegregation policy morphed into mandatory integration to enforce “racial balance.” This was achieved primarily through busing. However, as cities became predominantly non-white, partly because of white flight to the suburbs, racial balance became a statistical impossibility. Given the fierce popular resistance to busing, it is remarkable how long liberal elites, backed by the courts and bestowed with legitimacy by social scientists, doggedly pursued school integration until it was finally torpedoed by a Supreme Court packed with Republican appointees. In the 1974 *Milliken* decision, the Supreme Court blocked a metropolitan plan that would have bused Detroit students to suburban schools. This was the death knell of “forced integration,” followed by a series of rulings that, in the name of colorblindness, ended even voluntary programs to achieve racial integration.

Wolters defiantly challenges liberal orthodoxies about racial integration. There is no denying that the liberal project for school integration has been a failure, at least gauged by the fact that schools are more segregated today than in the 1950s. Given this fact, there is good reason to subject liberal orthodoxies to critical scrutiny, and to ask some hard questions. Was school integration a liberal mistake? Was it predicated on false assumptions about race and class, especially given the class character of schooling? Did liberals think
that school integration was a panacea that could overcome the effects of entrenched racism in labor markets and housing, which engendered deep poverty and racial isolation? Was busing a viable policy or did it backfire, producing white flight and exacerbating segregation? To be sure, there are painful lessons to be learned from Wolters’ skewering of liberals, as one liberal scheme after another failed to deliver on its promises, and as advocates of integration scrambled to explain the disappointing outcomes, only to lapse into victim-blaming discourses. First they placed the blame on the cultural deprivation of children; then on the inveterate racism of teachers and their self-fulfilling prophecies; then on the deficient black family; then on a “street culture” that lured children away from schooling; more recently on the subversive influence of hip hop and “the cool pose” and a youth culture that disparages intellectual achievement as “acting white.”

The problem is not that Wolters challenges liberal orthodoxy, but rather his resort to biology. Wolters tells the reader flat out: “I am an agnostic when it comes to the significance of IQ tests and the extent and import of differences in brain size” (x). He laments the fact that Hitler gave studies of race and intelligence a bad name. And he speaks in the argot of the white supremacist, objecting to racial “mixing” and “intermingling.” What he does not consider is the possibility that the liberal project was a failure of liberalism itself. It was hardly realistic to bus poor black children to schools in middle-class white neighborhoods without addressing the constellation of factors that consigned blacks to live in impoverished ghettos in the first place. In retrospect, it might have been better to have heeded Derrick Bell’s advice, born out of despair, to settle for separate but equal schools, on the proviso that they were made to be truly equal.


There are no doubt thousands of heavily illustrated books devoted to railroads, but of these only a relative handful could themselves be called works of art. At the head of that short list must stand The Railway: Art in the Age of Steam, which is arguably the most beautiful book ever published on the subject.

This evocative celebration belongs on the shelf of anyone interested in the history of railroad technology, as well as in the railroads’ many representations in visual and verbal texts. Familiar and evocative images from dozens of museums, art galleries, and collectors around the world are reproduced on these pages with infinite care and state-of-the-art printing skills. Given the complexity and the cost of the task, I think it highly unlikely that a more visually arresting book on railroads will ever be published. For those of us fortunate enough to see the original exhibit at the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art in Kansas City, this massive book is both a worthy companion and an encouragement to think more broadly about what the railroad represented to painters, photographers, and poets from around the globe.

The emphasis throughout is on fine art. Readers will not find included here or in the exhibit the genre of railroad art as represented by cartography or popular illustrations. Also missing are the dramatic paintings of the Grand Canyon, for example, done for the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway by artist Thomas Moran. Apparently the curators’ rationale was that art done to advertise railroad lands, tourism, or other services to potential buyers or users was too pedestrian to be worthy of inclusion. Fair enough. After all, curators must draw a line around what to include, and the body of art generated by the railroads themselves is at best an unwieldy mass, and that is just for the railroads of the
United States. Railroads in Canada and Europe generated numerous additional illustrations. The curators’ decision makes perfect sense, although an impressive exhibit could also be done of art (illustration) in the service of railroads on different continents.

In addition to the personal pleasure and sheer sense of wonder evoked by seeing so many timeless paintings and photographs collected in one place—not to mention an evocative selection of poetry like Walt Whitman’s “To a Locomotive in Winter”—the book features eight chapters written by authorities on the subjects of art, railroads, or some combination of the two. These highly useful essays are certain to spur further thinking on the subject. I would quibble with Michael Freeman’s assertion in his otherwise excellent introductory essay that the railroads of England and the United States introduced steam power to the popular consciousness only in the early 1830s. Perhaps that was true for England, but in the United States the steamboat had already done that a quarter century earlier on the Hudson River and almost two decades earlier on the Mississippi and the other great rivers of the nation’s heartland.

It is fortuitous that this book and the exhibit at the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art seek to present railway art in a global context. Even as I write this review (August 2009) I am mindful that Congress only recently passed legislation that supposedly lays the groundwork for a network of high-speed trains in the United States, something that existed for decades in Japan and Europe. But over the years we Americans grew insular on the subject of railways, ignoring technological advances in other countries because we were apparently so blinded by our ongoing love affair with the automobile. Furthermore, the consciousness of even the most avid American student of railroads seldom encompasses more than North America.

I can only reiterate that if you did not have the pleasure of seeing the museum exhibit, by all means search for a copy of this book. Better yet, buy yourself a copy because the first printing is certain to become a collector’s item.

St. Louis Mercantile Library
Carlos A. Schwantes


Throughout the twentieth century, a specter haunted the United States. American politicians and lawmen repeatedly issued stern warnings to the nation about sinister plots devised in Moscow and executed by the Kremlin’s agents in the US. Herbert Hoover’s Revolution in Action (1920), J. Edgar Hoover’s Masters of Deceit: The Story of Communism in America and How to Fight It (1958) and Ronald Reagan’s so-called “Evil Empire Speech” (1983) recognize dangerous, unthinking—“monolithic”—Communist threats as much as they reveal the daunting, un-American possibilities embedded within Communist ideology. Red Chicago: American Communism and its Grassroots, 1928-35 provides an opportunity for readers to reconsider a set of notions about the structure/function relationship between the Communist Party and American Communists that established foundations of 20th-century American politics and culture.

With Red Chicago Randi Storch delivers an account of American Communist Party activity in Chicago during the Party’s “Third Period.” Coinciding with the beginning of the Great Depression and extending to the Popular Front-era of 1935-1939, the Third Period, according to Storch, is “thought to be the most sectarian party history” and regarded as a moment in which “Soviet inspired tactics lent themselves to ultra-revolutionary rhetoric and behavior that alienated American workers.” For American Communists organizing in Chicago at this time, however, consistent engagement with diverse populations and
dynamic political conditions required them to “move away from the sectarianism in all of their major campaigns before order to do these things arrived from Moscow” (2).

By examining this process, Storch’s study seeks to “reorient the story of American Communism.” To navigate the blunt edges of the Third Period’s Stalinist hard line, Storch responds to what she describes as “more concrete questions” concerned with organizing efforts in Chicago, including: “Who were Chicago’s Communists? How, when and why did they implement Third Period policy? What did they actually do in the city’s neighborhoods and industries? How did they interpret the party line? When and why did they reinterpret it?” (4) Red Chicago goes a long way toward answering these questions, particularly by making use of documents held by The Russian State Archive of Social and Political History. Drawing upon materials from this archive, this social history and community study helps to “put a human face on American Communism” by allowing readers to consider the kinds of “places and personal and political choices Communist activists made into the social and political context in which they lived” (5).

In Red Chicago the lives, faces, places and voices emerge from Chicago’s widely divergent cultural and political landscape. It finds Third Period Communists active and involved in workers’ struggle to organize in the stockyards as well as the steel mills. Storch’s study brings attention to party efforts to organize homeless men sheltered in Westside flophouses and prevent evictions of African American families on the Southside. Over the course of the text, readers also see activists at work in meetings of the John Reed Club and in the pages of various ethnic language newspapers. In this way Red Chicago documents strategies and reasoning informing the full range of party organizing efforts and activities undertaken in one American city during the Hoover and Roosevelt administrations. At the same time it contributes to the effort to examine and perhaps revaluate the impact that the American Communist Party had upon and within the political landscape of the United States.

Keene State College

Michael Antonucci


In this innovative and insightful book, Charles Hiroshi Garrett encourages us to understand the complexity and contradictions of national identity of the United States by viewing music as primary source evidence. Garrett’s eclectic and imaginative research objects reveal that the American nation is neither unified nor uniform, but rather constructed out of conflict and contestation.

While drawing deftly on the kinds of close readings that his training as a musicologist provides, Garrett resists that discipline’s artificial segregation of musical genres into separate and discrete objects of study. He devotes careful, respectful, and equal treatment to the western art music of Charles Ives, the jazz compositions and performances of Jelly Roll Morton and Louis Armstrong, Broadway show tunes, and Hawaiian and neo-Hawaiian sounds in a variety of musical genres. Aesthetic concerns loom large in his evidence and arguments, but not in isolation from the social situations that give them their determinate meaning. In Garrett’s analyses, Jelly Roll Morton’s deployment of African American and Cuban musical devices in “New Orleans Blues” provides “a sonic metaphor for cultural difference and conflict” (62). He reads the ferocious power of Louis Armstrong’s playing of a sustained high C note at the start of five two-bar phrases to introduce lines that cascade down two octaves in “Gully Low Blues” as a musical enactment of southern rural working class assertiveness in the wake of migration to northern cities. Garrett shows
how the “forever foreign” identity ascribed to Asian immigrants derived embodied form in the pentatonic hints and parallel fourths of songs like “Chinatown, My Chinatown.” He reveals evidence of imperial nostalgia and rationalizations for colonialism in the vogue for Hawaiian music that crossed musical genres in the first decades of the twentieth century. Perhaps most impressive, Garrett explores the much-celebrated patterns of quotation and appropriation of vernacular songs in the music of Charles Ives and finds clear evidence of white anxiety about changes in demographic realities and social relations.

For musicologists, Struggling to Define a Nation offers an exemplary model of analysis built upon a dialogical relationship between the formal properties of musical texts without avoiding the formative power of their social and historical contexts. For scholars in American Studies, Garrett’s book reminds us once again of the constructed nature of the nation, of the plurality and diversity of its people, and of the conflict and contestations occluded by assertions of homogeneity, unity, and uniformity. It might have been profitable for Garrett to devote more attention to the industrial and economic matrices in which popular music and other forms of commodified leisure are produced and consumed. He might have engaged more directly with the arguments of social historians and cultural theorists about the centrality of “the other” and differences to unified claims about the nation. Yet this fine book is an exemplary blend of advanced musicology and sophisticated critical cultural studies, a volume certain to be widely read, cited, taught, and emulated.

University of California, Santa Barbara


The most enduring of the American myths is that of the rugged individualist, the yeoman landowner, who tamed the frontier and answered to no one. Equally important has been the struggle of the reformer to tame that individualistic nation through some form of social planning.

Andrew M. Shanken’s 194X provides an intellectual history of architecture and urban planning in a time of little building and less architecture, resulting in what he terms “paper architecture,” plans and images that linger in archives, but were never implemented. In addition, the study examines the political, economic, and social theories of the era through the lens of the planning movement of the war years. “194X” was a code for a future-oriented movement, rather than a style. Unable to design for actual buildings due to the exigencies of the wartime economy, planners developed plans unfettered by the restraints of economics, politics, or aesthetics. In the process, architecture and urban planning changed to a theoretical construct, in which planners created model cities and towns designed to improve urban life and community.

The study shows the array of forces used to market and promote the concept of urban planning and with it the promotion of a top-down confiscatory approach to postwar life while simultaneously paying lip service to American ideals. Minimizing and distorting any parallels to the centralized power of European ‘isms” of the 1930s, the planners nevertheless presumed the authority of totalitarianism. At the same time, the study lays bare the American distrust of reformers, especially those whose ideas would be imposed at the expense of individualism and private property.

Shanken examines the process in which the plans themselves became a genre, a futuristic literature, which allowed for a new intellectual analysis and debate. An odd mixture of designers, engineers, psychologists, sociologists, joined the discourse on a
planned society in the media, producing this culture of planning along with a wholesale acceptance of modernism.

Despite their attempts to cloak the planning in the rhetoric of motherhood and apple pie, the planners, many of whom had cut their professional teeth in the Socialist Realism of Europe in the 1920s and 1930s, were eager to replace the notion of private property with a collective version of the city. In promoting their visions, the planners walked a tight line between wartime xenophobia, fears of “un-American” ideas, and a government unwilling to embrace and impose their more rigid and centralized plans. The appearance of a “powerful centralized government bureau” would be softened. Landowners would receive a share in the new neighborhood for vacating the land, resulting in “a forced migration and demographic shift” (67).

The well-researched, well-written and well-illustrated book offers an interesting case study of American political reform that serves well beyond the confines of architectural or planning history. It could be useful reading in a graduate class in history, political science, urban studies or architecture, but its often specialized vocabulary makes it less appropriate for an undergraduate class.

Hofstra University, Emeritus

Barbara M. Kelly


The Fashion Institute of Technology (FIT) is justifiably well known for its visually stunning, scholarly exhibitions and companion books. This volume, companion to the recent exhibit “American Beauty: Aesthetics and Innovation in Fashion,” does not disappoint readers who left the exhibit wanting more or who were too far from New York to see it.

Exhibit curator and author Patricia Mears features 75 garments, selected to illustrate the range of design and construction elements, rather than to convey an historical narrative. The designers include legendary names (Claire McCardell, Bonnie Cashin), nearly forgotten giants (Jesse Franklin Turner, Elizabeth Hawes) and emerging stars (the Mulleavy sisters of Rodarte, Epperson). Mears made the adventurous decision to engage the viewer in a sophisticated visual and material culture analysis of American fashion, examining the garments not only as finished objects, but also as evidence of the design process. She argues, quite persuasively, that American fashion was driven by dressmaking (as opposed to tailoring) before World War II and that the dressmaker’s skills continue to play a significant role in American fashion innovation.

In American Beauty, Mears is able to illustrate her argument with beautiful examples from the exhibit, 120 of them in color. Because this is a large format book, (10” by 13”) and so many of the images are full-page, the close-up images of garments are particularly effective. The reader has a much better view of the Rodarte steam dyed silk tulle and black mohair yarn evening gown (166-167) than a museum visitor could have enjoyed.

FIT deputy director Mears is the author of Madame Grès: Sphinx of Fashion (Yale, 2007) and coauthor (with Valerie Steele and Clare Sauro) of Ralph Ricci: The Art of Weightlessness (2007). American Beauty is equally valuable for serious students of fashion design. Her exhibitions and published works are insightful and demonstrate a deep understanding of fashion as art and craft. The major drawbacks of this volume may not be the author’s fault: there are no page numbers after 154, and no index.

University of Maryland

Jo Barraclough Paoletti
In his thought-provoking revision of the East St. Louis upheaval of 1917, Charles L. Lumpkins contends that violence was sparked, not by social strain over interracial industrial employment—as interpreted by Elliott M. Rudwick (1964) and Malcolm McLaughlin (2005)—but by white politicians and realtors seeking to suppress black political independence. Hence he embraces Roberta Senechal’s thesis for the 1908 Springfield riot (1990) and evaluates the East St. Louis outbreak within the era of industrialization, migration, and war, from 1898 to 1921, when urban blacks sought equality. He defines the rioting as “a pogrom: an assault, condoned by officials, to destroy a community defined by ethnicity, race, or some other identity”; that is, “another example of ethnic cleansing” (xi) as described by James Loewen (2005) and Elliot Jaspin (2007). Indeed, the bloodletting in largely downtown East St. Louis officially claimed thirty-nine black lives (500 rumored), destroyed hundreds of black homes, and chased over 7,000 blacks from the city; in comparison, nine whites lay dead (forty rumored), clearly indicating a one-sided assault.

In expanding on the sources of Rudwick and McLaughlin, Lumpkin instead emphasizes black political activity and community-building that—given the voting potential of oncoming black migrants—threatened white powerbrokers, who promoted racial fear and violence. In its aftermath, black leaders continued their political activism, albeit appearing more accommodating of white society. They understood the lesson of racial compliance, yet never accepted it completely or unconditionally. Thereafter, black efforts paid off, assisted by the Great Depression and World War II. In the wake of the Civil Rights Movement that ended segregation and discrimination, however, the black majority in East St. Louis found itself, like counterparts elsewhere, in control of a municipality weakened by the exodus of whites, economic de-industrialization, and self-serving political bosses of both races. Tragically, this postwar urban crisis upturned fifty years of struggle for racial equality by black residents.

Like other recent studies of racial violence, Lumpkins stresses black political initiative as the reason for white violence and interprets it as a pogrom “or ethnic cleansing” (8). Pogrom is viable, though fuller comparison is needed to support the contention that the East St. Louis Race Riot is the “American equivalent” (77) of pogroms against 19th Century Russia Jews and 20th Century Armenians. However, applying the term ethnic cleansing—which historically connotes widespread extermination—is more problematic, in part because East St. Louis whites avoided invading “predominantly or all-black districts” (125)—where most blacks lived—for fear of being harmed themselves. This suggests more a white desire to keep blacks in their place rather than annihilate them; and why, after the riot, black politicians appeared to tow the color line.

This terminology question notwithstanding, American Pogrom falls within William M. Tuttle, Jr.’s 2004 Mid-America Conference on History call for the reconsideration of all U.S. riots of this era within the context of black insurgency and comparative racism. Lumpkins’s book is an important addition for understanding the historical significance of the East St. Louis violence and the evolution of rioting historiography.
A couple of years back, after a student told me she had kept company with *The Great Gatsby* as an assigned text in every college semester for five straight, zigzagging through an undergraduate major in English, I wheezed over to the university bookstore to see if such a pattern were really possible. A way to test for it is to pause in the aisles where required books are stacked by course and section, and let the eyes slide out of focus, like looking for one of those concealed images—space ship, smirking clown—in the dot-art pictures they sell at the mall. Sure enough: in that term at least, the familiar spine of the paperback, battered from multiple uses and sell-backs, popped up all along the shelf with frightening frequency.

If that holds true at your own institution, and if you consider that hundreds of thousands of American students also have to negotiate this novel at least once in high school as well (as standard fare in an AP course), then what most of us are really up to is *re-teaching* *The Great Gatsby*, extending, refreshing, and complicating whatever it is that our students think they were taught before. In the Preface and the Introduction to this volume, Jackson Bryer and Nancy VanArsdale, as veteran and established scholars in both American Literature and American Studies, countenance that reality: four hundred thousand copies sold annually, and surveys attesting that most of us in the colleges know that we’re leading a return visit.

The MLA has been turning out this “Approaches to Teaching” series for a long time; these books provide cover for that professional monopoly, against innuendo that they have lost relevance to basic trades that keep them funded. The format of these volumes frontloads the material that working teachers will want to reach for in a hurry—concise descriptions of biographies, collections of criticism, contemporary reviews, high-quality book chapters and articles; and Bryer’s presentation in the *Gatsby* guide is distinguished for its clarity and for the shrewdness of the choices it makes, sorting through a ton of published commentary and organizing it by subject and theme. VanArsdale’s catalog and commentary on web resources is also a well-written and discriminating shortcut; and James L. W. West III’s straightforward history of “The Composition and Publication of The Great Gatsby” can arm conscientious instructors with everything they need to know about how this novel came into being.

After all that, the volume presents a buffet of critical engagements with the novel—some of them plausibly centered on the dynamics and cultural context of an undergraduate classroom, and some of them not. Though none of the contributed essays directly addresses the challenges or opportunities that might inhere in rereading and re-teaching *Gatsby*, most of them implicitly address a question that hangs in the air, with regard to a book whose very name has taken on iconic presence in our popular and literary culture: why so much fuss for so long about a short book in which a flashy, sleazy guy from nowhere obsesses about an essentially-worthless socialite and for his troubles gets shot in a swimming pool, a plotline that doesn’t seem at all different from nightly fare on the CW Network? Kim Curnutt’s piece on “Modernity and Milieu” provides cogent answers, highlighting “a profound shift in cultural conceptions of identity” (40), brought on by the rise of mass culture, by the marketing of personal style, by the erosion of old social orders, and by “the growing threat of anonymity in mass society” (41), a gaudy world offering up the possibility that anyone—random somebodies here and there—could become anything they wanted, and that most would be nothing at all. Jonathan Barron’s essay on the theme
of regionalism and class is one of the few that countenances the potential importance of exactly where, right now, *The Great Gatsby* is being read and taught, that the chemistry engagement can vary with region, college, and classroom dynamics. Comparing his own teaching experiences, he finds an interesting commonality:

My students . . . had deliberately made every effort to stay away from the East: both St. Olaf College and the University of Southern Mississippi draw most of their students from the region, and few of them come from more than two hundred miles away. However they may have understood why Gatsby would leave his region, the idea of leaving theirs was as foreign to them as my own sense of inner exile was true to me. Only by being honest and willing to expose my own experience as an easterner has it been possible for me to address the meaning of the East in this novel with my midwestern [*sic*] and southern students.

Other essays in this part of the guide skip regional difference and focus on what they assume to be national issues: suburbanization, or the widening divide between super-rich and the poor. When they approach questions that might seem like chestnuts—is Gatsby the hero of the book? Is Nick all done with The American Dream, or still in its thrall?—some of them show imagination. Kim Moreland goes on a flanking maneuver to come at the novel through Hollywood iconography, not just the old film with Redford and Waterston, but also *Goodfellas* and *The Godfather* and anything else that can trigger a pop-culture analogue. When we get into “Narrative Structure and Style” an expected problem breaks out: commentaries veering away from the classroom, and reading at times like warmed-over papers from a seminar. Using *Gatsby* to illustrate a concept of narrative progression borrowed from Russian formalism, James Phelan seems disappointed that Fitzgerald “. . . does sometimes show the deficiencies of Nick the character without also showing Nick the narrator’s awareness of those deficiencies,” (107) though for many readers, Nick’s limited self-awareness might be the true heart of the drama, more compelling than anything that goes on between the other people at the Plaza or at the lawn parties; and a better reason for keeping the novel in the canon than elegance in the fabula or the narrative arc. Observing that “Many students remain idealistic and romantic” (110)—why do these eighteen year-olds insist on being eighteen?—Mark Shipman doses them with a protracted reading “From a Heracleitean perspective” (113), in order to “establish the legitimacy of Nick Carraway’s narrative capabilities; this approach is particularly appropriate to the structural and thematic elements of *The Great Gatsby*” (113). Because there is no mention here of Fitzgerald reading Heracleitus at Princeton or Newman, this approach seems like a laborious lowering of the novel onto a matrix more Procrustean than anything else.

A couple of other essays seem to forget teaching and offer up readings centrifuged out of critical studies. These are harmless, and with an aggressive run through them one can cull out some interesting insights to spice up comments on student papers or bump a classroom conversation onto a new track when it sags. The only approach that seems a true relic from a heyday of professorial moralizing, when more of our tenured faculty knew all of the answers, is one that wraps up with this cadenza:

On one level [*Gatsby*] is the engaging story of a Horatio Alger character, who, with idealistic intentions but criminal means, fails to achieve his dreams. His failure points up the extent to which the
American dream is a myth, a dangerous lie, a gasbag, like the air mattress supporting Gatsby in his pool at his death . . . On another level, it is a savage indictment of the corruption of the American dream, degenerated from its unlimited and moral potential to an obscene commercialism, figured in America’s business practices, criminality, and pandemic immorality. But it also an indictment of our own moral culpability, much like Nick’s, our willingness to observe immorality and accept it more or less complacently (174).

Would your own students be convinced by a usurpation like this, jeremiads paid for by fat endowments, high tuition, and taxes; and therefore complicit, egregiously so, in the supposedly depraved American capitalist-materialist enterprise? It won’t occur to them that *The Great Gatsby* might not be an obliteration of The American Dream at all, but maybe a novel, a story of profound ambivalence, written for money by an author who himself chased after glitz and cash until he dropped dead in a Hollywood apartment? Nick isn’t cured at the end—that’s a basic reason for that famous, final, and contradictory incantation; that’s the core of what still haunts; and if we want to throw “we” and “our” and “us” around profligately in rooms full of captive students—some of whose parents came to the United States long after Fitzgerald was dead, intelligent people searching for that dream, people who might actually believe they found it—then “we” might want to countenance the possibility that some part of “us” still believes in it too.

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Bruce Michelson


This is an interesting, if somewhat technical, book about a famous psychologist, Raymond B. Cattell, a British born and educated scholar who became famous in America for his prodigious outpouring of books and articles on the subject of the human personality. The author, himself a psychologist, has found it necessary to ‘expose’ his subject for that eminence’s writings on race and eugenics. This is a case with some parallels with that of the famous British psychologist Sir Cyril Burt and the question of Burt’s likely fudging of data—even of inventing fictive subjects and co-investigators—to prove that nature prevailed over nurture in the forming of intelligence. In his early years Cattell was, as a fledgling practitioner in Britain, in fact a protégé of Burt’s, as well as a student of Charles Spearman and a devotee of William McDougall, both eminences in British psychology. All three were highly intelligent and well-known, albeit unapologetic, supporters of eugenics and similar racist nostrums.

As a publishing scholar Cattell was no slouch; he published fifty-six books, more than five hundred journal articles and book chapters, and approximately thirty standardized instruments for evaluating personality in his seventy-year career, spent mainly as a research professor at the University of Illinois. In August 1997, the American Psychological Association announced that Cattell had been selected as that year’s recipient of the American Psychological Foundation Gold Medal Award for Life Achievement in Psychological Science. Two days before the award ceremony, the Foundation abruptly postponed, and eventually denied, the award to Cattell because of concerns about his views on racial segregation and eugenics.

What the author is at pains to show, and does so very well, is that there was no contradiction between Cattell’s technical work and his racist politics. Factor analysis is
a statistical technique in which the investigator attempts to discern, by a series of parallel measurements, whether there is or is not an underlying core of common traits. What Cattell proposed to do was to devise a series of instruments that would show an underlying basis of personality traits, which, he asserted, were therefore innate. Thus there could be personality types among different individuals and even nations could have personalities. This is something like the old story in which, if one has a hammer, one is always searching for a nail. The difficult, if rewarding, part of the book comes with the author’s careful dissection of Cattell’s scientific work, and curious readers are referred to this large chapter. Apparently Cattell was honored for being a pioneer in personality assessment, but few, if any, could replicate his findings—a devastating finding for any scientist—and almost all who followed him in the field paid homage to his pioneering work which they nevertheless concluded was, at best, problematic and not useful to those who did not share his assumptions.

It turns out that Cattell wrote pieces in which he endorsed eugenics, racial segregation, and even the prewar National Socialist regime in Germany—and it was these actions, performed throughout his career as parallel to his scientific work, that scotched his chances for that Gold Medal of the American Psychological Foundation. The author deals with these matters dispassionately and in an expert manner.

Iowa State University

Hamilton Cravens


Poe’s influence as a critic, especially in other countries, is impressive, considering the relatively few documents on which his reputation is based. Levine and Levine have brought together texts that reveal the major elements of Poe’s literary theory. Among the eight included in this volume, some are better known to readers, such as “The Philosophy of Composition,” “The Poetic Principle,” and “The Rationale of Verse.” Others, including “Exordium” (a title the editors have provided) and “Prospectuses for ‘The Penn’ and ‘The Stylus’,” are less familiar but also interesting to examine as they relate to Poe’s views on the theory of writing and the theory of criticism.

The editors’ research on the original documents is impressive. They explain the versions of Poe’s texts presented in the book and indicate numerous variant readings. In his introduction to the book, Stuart Levine wisely points out that there are contradictions in Poe’s statements about the goals of literary works and how they are created. Levine concludes that “Poe’s ‘critical position’ cannot really be fixed with any degree of reliability, for it shifted with the context of each writing assignment he set for himself” (xii).

In the introductions to the individual texts, the editors give examples of Poe’s inconsistencies, the influence of other writers on his work, and his repetition of some quotations and references. For readers who are disconcerted by Poe’s contradictions, the editors express the opinion that “acquiring a feel for his inconsistency is a good first step toward getting to know Poe’s mind” (4). These introductions are well-written and very enlightening, even for those who are familiar with Poe’s texts. For readers who have wondered who “B” is in the title “Letter to B------,” three possibilities are given, but the mystery still remains (12-13).

The editors place Poe’s work in the context of the social, political and economic environment in which he lived. In addition to their own research, the Levines refer to insights from other scholars who have published on Poe’s critical theory over the years, including Thomas Ollive Mabbott, Burton R. Pollin, and Eric Carlson, among others. This
collection of Poe’s texts relating to critical theory was originally planned to be part of Burton Pollin’s *Collected Writings of Edgar Allan Poe*. The extensive bibliography and well-organized index make this book accessible to students and Poe scholars alike. The Levines have made major contributions to Poe studies with this volume and numerous analytical studies that help readers appreciate the work of one of America’s most famous writers.

Ohio University

Lois Vines


*Give My Poor Heart Ease* is a thick slice of rich, gooey American pie. Based on William Ferris’s field recordings from the late 1960s through the mid-1970s, it showcases the voices of African American bluesmen, storytellers, preachers, church ladies, prisoners, and assorted other characters along Highway 61, which stretches down the Mississippi Delta. In one selection B.B. King instructs: “All you got to do is sit back/And dig where it’s coming from,/Not only with your ear, but with your heart” (162). In that same spirit, one should appreciate this book. It avoids critical analysis, eschews theory, and supplies limited historical context. Instead it lets blues people speak for themselves, and the reader inevitably feels connected to them.

Ferris offers a straightforward, autobiographical introduction that begins with his childhood in rural Warren County, fifteen miles south of Vicksburg. He describes storytelling traditions, crude racism, and his white family’s iconoclastic liberalism. “The voices I heard as a child always remained in my ear,” he writes. “They were like teachers who led me as a white person to embrace black culture” (6). He relates how, as a folklorist, he built trusting relationships within black communities, implicitly asking his audience to trust his interviewees’ words as authentic.

The voices include Mary Gordon, Ferris’s old family housekeeper, who sings an irreverent song mocking immoral preachers, but only after Ferris promises to keep it away from her own pastor. They include Scott Dunbar, who delivers a bizarre, somehow irresistible mix of song and speech about courting a daughter by tricking her parents. They include Louis Dotson, who explains how to make a one-string guitar with broom wire, nails, and rocks. The voices tell tall tales, chant work songs, describe work in the cotton fields, depict sex and love and heartache, and relate the joys and pains of being black in the South.

If the stories share a common thread, it is their intertwining of the sacred and profane. The church and the juke joint need each other; bawdy blues and gospel hymns are two sides of one coin. Both offer comfort and meaning. “The blues can give you a feeling that nothing else can give you. And once I get that feeling, I smile to myself,” says Willie Dixon. “You look at yourself, and you see where you came from and where you’re going. And you feel like you’ve got a beautiful chance, thanks to the blues” (184).

The book is a monument to the career of Ferris, a former chairman of the National Endowment of the Humanities, co-editor of the *Encyclopedia of Southern Culture*, and current senior associate director of the Center for the Study of the American South at the University of North Carolina. It is visually rich, with arresting photographs and a generous layout. It also includes a companion CD and a DVD. This sensory immersion in the material only deepens the reader’s personal identification with the region’s extraordinary people, music, and culture.

University of Memphis

Aram Goudsouzian

Many of us know of the impressive World’s Fair archive at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of American History. Thanks to Julie Brown, an independent scholar who is also a Research Associate in the Department of Medicine, Science, and Society at NMAH, those of us who want to dig through its materials related to health, medicine, and technology may now do some very thorough sifting from home.

_Health and Medicine on Display_ is not an American Studies book. Nor is it a particularly interdisciplinary one. It is, however, an important resource for scholars working at the intersections of popular, material and visual culture; of spectacles and civic life; of militarization and citizenship; and technology and health.

Brown does an admirable job rendering an extraordinary amount of data on technology, health, and medicine across four massive Expositions into digestible form in chapters devoted to the 1876 Philadelphia Exposition, the 1893 Chicago Columbia Exposition, and the 1901 and 1904 Buffalo and St. Louis Expositions. She tackles the historian’s challenge of creating order out of chaos by dividing the chapters into subsections, each of which explores a kind or originator of display (state boards of health, exhibits of government medical departments) or issue of sanitation and infrastructure. At the same time, Brown makes visible in several places the difficulty that fairgoers would have had discerning many of these patterns. The book, then, reveals the balkinization of these displays while creating ordered sets of data for other scholars to mine.

Brown’s work is most interesting when describing the complex relationship between the Expositions and their hosting cities. In all cases, the Expositions’ infrastructures, especially in sanitation and health services, exceeded those available in their surrounding “real” cities. The result was that citizens, both fairgoers and internal workers, experienced from within unusual infrastructures of health.

Described by one medical professional as a “vast camp,” these individual Exposition sites became virtual residences for the thousands of employees who gathered to construct, coordinate, and ultimately dismantle these temporary Expositions (88). To care for those injured on duty or sickened during their stay, as well as the general fair-going public, Exposition planners created on-site medical facilities and provided employees with medical coverage—a rarity in the world outside. Working within the Exposition thus ironically meant access to both exceptional bodily care and exceptional bodily risk (witness the 15 firefighters who died at the Columbia Exposition in front of thousands).

Visitors occasionally witnessed the loss of life. More often, however, they witnessed advanced medical facilities and interactive displays that emphasized the strength of regional medical infrastructures and the national military. (Occasional outbreaks of disease were typically hidden from the media and host communities.) The 1901 Buffalo Pan-American Exposition, for example, offered an emergency hospital and twenty-seven-bed regular hospital with wards for men and women as well as a morgue and accommodations for resident medical staff. As impressive as such medical spaces were, they were dwarfed by what the military had to offer. Thanks to their substantial funding and their centralized administration, displays by the Army and Navy were bigger, more technologically infused, and more entertaining than their neighboring medical and nutritional exhibits which tended to rely on small stands and data to communicate with passersby. In 1893, for example, visitors to Chicago’s White City could tour the Army’s replica hospital building, complete with troop encampment in an adjacent field and demonstrations of soldier wound treatment and transport. Afterwards they could head to Lake Michigan where they
could cross a pier to climb down and tour a stocked dispensary inside a full-scale model of a 10,300-ton coastline battleship.

Brown recreates these fairgoers and their ample interest in displays on health and medicine, as well as the competing manufacturers and municipalities who sought to engage them. In Chicago visitors toured prosthetic manufacturers’ stands and tables of anatomical models, saw accounts of the latest in American nursing education, tasted dishes emerging from the nutrition-focused New England Kitchen and crowded in to see a widow and her children attempting to subsist on 54 cents a day. In Buffalo medical displays bridged the proper and the popular. The “Infant Incubator,” stationed on the midway, drew regular crowds. In Buffalo, and again in St. Louis, people lined up for X-ray demonstrations and displays of large and small electro therapeutic devices.

According to Brown, “these expositions provided a rich cultural context for . . . making hygiene and health an all-encompassing concept that the general public could understand and take responsibility for” (10). Much of this relied on the power of visually communicated information and experiences. Health and Medicine on Display pays close attention to the role of the visual in a number of ways. Pamphlets and photographs become three dimensional in her analysis, and her close attention to the layout of individual exhibits enables the reader to experience these devices, spaces, and materials in the patterns in which they would have been initially encountered. Also important is her attention to how these displays, in aggregate, enabled fairgoers to “see” the issue of health at the turn of the century. These spectacles offered the first opportunity to see and compare what individual state health boards, institutions, and local manufacturers were doing. The preparation of specific data on regional health, including number of doctors per capita, enabled people—many for the first time—to locate where their individual experiences could be placed on regional, state, and in rare cases national maps. Yet, at the same time, because so much of this data was dispersed throughout the Expositions, visitors may have been particularly encouraged to be active seers. The visual is also important in Brown’s analysis of changing government Expositions over time. In Buffalo alone, the Government building showed twenty-six free biograph films, fifty slide programs, and one hundred recordings of everything from recitations at the Carlisle Indian School to footage of the Naval Academy. Brown’s recreation enables the reader to see visual technology complementing material technology, especially in the case of the military’s use of media to rehabilitate its image after the Spanish-American war.

At the same time, Brown reveals that what was unseen was also significant at the fair. Each exposition was in fact a marvel of sanitary infrastructure—Chicago’s fair offered the first civic water treatment facility; all include centrally controlled, effective management of sewage and drainage, as well as concessions. In Buffalo the Medical Department worked cooperatively with city health officials to centrally control the management of all concessions and waste. Well before the Progressive Era’s pure food and drug laws went into effect, Expositions operated under what one observer characterized as the “iron hand” of chief sanitary officers (98). Exhibits on health, new tools and gadgets, and medical services displays, however, drew far more attention than did the mainly smooth functioning “health infrastructure” undergirding it all, in spite of the fact that the achievement of general civic health in these environments was arguably the most important medical advance displayed.

Health and Medicine on Display fascinates with details and impresses with its organization. Yet ultimately it does not add up to more than the sum of its parts. This may, in fact, be Brown’s intention given the copious amounts of data that she has processed in order to create the neat category groupings she provides. Yet this reader longed for a
narrative that would also situate these expositions within the larger technological hubris or health contestations of their time. How does this close attention to the actual spaces, objects, and events that people confronted in expositions change our understanding of Nye’s “American Technological Sublime,” for instance? One wonders if we need to re-couple health and technology, for instance, given these early, and very public entanglements of both. There are also important insights here to draw out about how we imagine the health or progress of “the state” or “the nation” from what was, in essence, a jumble of competing, regionalized, individual parts. These expositions enabled people to experience a civic reality that did not in fact exist. They could receive treatment at well-apportioned hospitals, drink clean water, and learn how to achieve health. After the fairs folded, the mirage faded, and people were again left with warring medical “experts,” inadequate civic sanitation services, and vast regional differences in health information and access. Brown provides important clues for those of us who wonder why universal health care has been so elusive in a culture so health obsessed. Good work could be done building upon these materials to better understand the cultural history and significance of these short-term “health spectacles” in American life. Health and Medicine on Display ultimately raises more questions than it answers; this may be a good thing for the next generation of American studies scholars working in the nexus between medicine, health, technology, and U.S. popular culture.


How does one write about the complexities of World War II, what John Keegan called the largest single event in human history? Lisa L. Ossian, Codirector of the Iowa Studies Center, answers her own question with an analysis of four Iowa home fronts: farm, production, community, and kitchen. The federal government swiftly succeeded in using each to transform isolationist Iowans into soldiers at home, a daunting challenge in a state that in 1940 voted against Franklin Roosevelt, whose running mate and former Secretary of Agriculture was Iowa native Henry Wallace. Ossian casts the four home fronts as operating in spectacular fashion, requiring unparalleled commitment and sacrifice, while presenting what these transformations held for postwar Iowa.

Once Iowans were convinced that tractors were tanks and “agriculture would need to break all previous production records for this war” (22), farmers, faced with a labor shortage as sons and hired farmhands went off to war, bought more and better machinery, a huge shift in a state where almost half of farms still relied on animal power. Corporations (whose advertisements Ossian examined in popular farm journals) and the government contended that “power farming meant freedom and better living . . . and mechanization would create a farm to which sons and daughters would enthusiastically return after war’s end, increasing the longevity of the family farm” (26). Power farming, of course, didn’t save the family farm. But the corporate farm model—mechanized, consolidated, and more profitable—was thus set in place in Iowa during World War II, Ossian maintains, and it was too hard to resist.

In her analysis of the production home front, Ossian, drawing heavily upon newspaper reports, focuses on ordnance plants in Ankeny (near Des Moines) and Burlington, both of them producing bombs and bullets for the Allies before America’s entry into the war. Explosions at the Iowa Ordnance Plant in Burlington—the state’s largest construction project ever—five days after Pearl Harbor and another three months later killed thirty-
three men. Many Iowa industries converted to wartime production, including Maytag, the world’s largest washing machine manufacturer. Ossian agrees with those scholars for whom “Rosie the Riveter as a real worker is really a romantic myth” (81), for women working in the factories were considered second-class employees who would give up the jobs when their men came home from war.

Perhaps the chapter on the community front, “Bonds, Scrap, and Boys,” reveals most fully the level of engagement in Iowans’ war effort. In a state that totaled almost $2.5 billion during the federal government’s eight war bond drives, buying bonds wasn’t enough. The federally mandated Women’s Salvage Army conducted scrap iron drives in every county, and children, who knew where to find the neighborhood junk, “truly became the heroes of the scrap drives” (102). Here, too, Ossian discusses the ultimate community sacrifice: the deaths of Waterloo’s five Sullivan brothers, all aboard the U.S.S. Juneau when it sank, is believed to be the greatest sacrifice by an American family.

But the truest of heroes at home were likely those with the copious ration book in their hands, the women on the kitchen front. They were told by leaders to “ration with ingenuity,” something farm wives had already accomplished in World War I, when Food Administrator Herbert Hoover predicted that food would win the war. “The women who coped with rationing the best lived in small towns and on farms” (127), for they were longtime experts at gardening and canning food in quart jars, a useful practice considering that the government named over two hundred foods on its ration list.

The Home Fronts of Iowa presents a startling and clear reason why World War II is remembered as “the good war,” reminding us what is possible when patriotism entails more than slapping yellow-ribbon bumper stickers on sport utility vehicles.

Wayne State College

Max McElwain


“I want to posit in this book a new myth of origin of the United States,” writes the author Clarence E. Walker, who suggests that “at the moment of its creation the nation was not a white racial space but a mixed race one” (2). Rather than positioning George and Martha Washington as “founding parents” of the United States, the author suggests that Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings replace them. Walker makes his case for the “new myth” in Mongrel Nation, a slim two-part volume containing the essays “Sexuality,” and “Character and History, or ‘Chloroform in Print.’” Walker acknowledges that his proposition will disturb some readers. Nevertheless, he focuses sharply on the Jefferson-Hemings nexus to answer questions about national identity, racial provenance, and who owns history.

An 1802 story in the Richmond Recorder by James Thompson Callender claimed that Jefferson had fathered children with Hemings. “Interracial sex was normative,” says Walker (27) yet such a charge against Jefferson, president of the United States, was “news.” Besides, he had published disparaging remarks about people of African descent, especially women, in Query XIV of his Notes on the State of Virginia (1787), causing Jefferson’s defenders to believe he would never become intimate with a black woman. As a result, the “news” prompted members of Jefferson’s family, his admirers, and some historians to vigorously dispute Callender’s charge. Jefferson’s defenders remain vigilant, and their attitude is, in Walker’s view, “representative of a congenital racial tension in American society” (2).
A brief review of the scholarship about Jefferson and Hemings spanning nearly fifty years calls attention to the continuous debate in which Annette Gordon-Reed’s *Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings: An American Controversy* (1997) and the 1998 DNA evidence linking Jefferson to a Hemings offspring are integral. Given the body of existing literature, one must ask what will *Mongrel Nation* contribute? Briefly, *Mongrel Nation* takes the thirty-eight-year-long Jefferson-Hemings relationship out of the “closet” and places it within a global context. The United States was part of a larger colonial settler society or plantation complex in which creolization, primarily by exploiting enslaved women, occurred. It is against this historical backdrop that Walker asks, why did intimacy between blacks and whites create angst in the United States? In actuality, it is not solely the intimacy but the resulting “mongrel nation” that has been disturbing.

Whiteness, rather than an impossible mixture thereof, defined and was the criteria for American citizenship. Children resulting from white-black relationships prompted fractionized calculations or mathematical blood analyses that relegated non-whites to an outsider status in the “racial state.” Mixtures threatened the creation of a “pure” republic. Within this context, Jefferson’s ideas about colonizing blacks outside the United States are understandable. Writing or theorizing about people of African descent was one thing, but living with or loving them was another matter. How was that possible? Was it ambivalence about blacks that created a racial and sexual amnesia? Did that amnesia create a canonical master narrative of the United States distinguished by “unblemished whiteness?”

The answer may be found in Walker’s alternative readings and discussions of who Americans are as a nation. Had another Virginia planter, for example George Wythe or John Wayles rather than the esteemed Thomas Jefferson, been accused of intimacy with an enslaved woman would the results have been the same? Obviously, the answer is no, but answers to more edgy questions give pause. For example, do readers know with certainty that Sally Hemings was phenotypically black? How did she identify herself? There is no extant description of her skin color, hair texture, or facial features to determine that they were clearly Caucasian or Negroid. Even so, one must ask if she and her half-sister, Martha Wayles, Thomas Jefferson’s wife, bore a striking resemblance. Could Jefferson, a forty-one-year-old widower, have subjected Sally’s identity to the mathematics of blood as he once explained: “Our canon considers two crosses with the pure white, and a third with any degree of mixture, however small as clearing the issue of Negro blood” (32)? Did the “crosses” catapult Beverly, Eston, and Harriet, Sally’s progeny, from black to white? Regardless of what one interprets or identifies as phenotypical features, race is not a stable entity.

Walker incorporates discussions of the motion pictures *Imitation of Life*, *Pinky*, and *Lost Boundaries* as ways to expand upon the idea of race as a social and historical construction. Writers, filmmakers, and producers address subjects that many historians avoid. Walker is an exception when interrogating the sexual relationship between Jefferson and Hemings and suggesting that Sally Hemings not be considered as a rape victim, but as one engaged in a form of sexual negotiations such as those documented by scholars, including Hillary Beckles, Gilberto Freyer, and Trevor Burnard, elsewhere in the plantation complex.

In the final pages of *Mongrel Nation*, Walker moves the discussion of the Jefferson-Hemings relationship onto post-DNA terrain. Notwithstanding the scientific findings, the Jefferson apologists have renewed their efforts to defend the “sage of Monticello.” According to Walker, “their continuing hostility is a racist and reactionary angst that extends well beyond the reputation of Jefferson himself to include anxiety about how the history of the American republic as a whole is to be written and evaluated.” The DNA evidence
makes sanitizing the Jefferson-Hemings relationship into “chloroform in print” nearly impossible.

In the larger historical context, defining moments of the 1960s that were associated with the civil rights movement, women’s rights movement, sexual revolution, and war in Vietnam along with more recent expansions in ethnic, cultural, and immigration studies make it possible for scholars to revise and reconceptualize the master narrative of the United States. The results will reflect complexities in American history, and the complexions of the Americans included in that history will attest to the existence of what Clarence E. Walker describes in Mongrel Nation.

University of Missouri, Columbia


Moving Images contributes significantly to making the World War II incarceration of Japanese Americans a part of public memory by skilfully analyzing “how images of incarceration were made, how they meant to function, and how they have been reproduced subsequently by the popular press and museums to construct versions of public history” (19). Alinder’s study lives up to the promise of its title. The five tightly structured chapters discuss the period of uprooting just after the Presidential Proclamation 9066, the Manzanar “camp” in the deserts of Eastern California, and more contemporary contextualizations of the internment in The Museum of Modern Art to the National Museum of American History. Alinder weaves in the generations affected by this dislocation: the Nisei, the American born children of the Issei pioneers, and their Sansei and Yonsei progeny, for whom this episode is a family memory rather than a personal experience. Individual photographs receive deft consideration, both for the information they hold and for their potency as images that contain moving, emotional import.

Alinder constructively places Dorothea Lange’s War Relocation Administration photographs in West Coast cities in the context of her previous work with the Farm Security Administration in the 1930s. Lange portrayed the distressing removal so potently that many of her images were not used or were overwritten by WRA bureaucrats with textual non sequiturs. Ansel Adams’s work at Manzanar intently gave individuals their dignity, but in patriotic contexts that stripped them of their ethnicity. She contrasts these external views to images generated by Japanese Americans: the professional photographs of Toyo Miyatake and the amateur images in the Manzanar high school yearbook. Alinder concludes with two contemporary Yonsai photographers who have interpreted the ruined sites.

Although the subtitle refers broadly to Japanese American incarceration, this is really a study of Manzanar. We do not see the Heart Mountain photographs of Mieth and Hagel, and we are not able to place Manzanar into the broader landscape of memory of the ten “camps.” The conundrum of the loyalty questionnaire that vexed Nisei citizens, producing both the “no-no” boys at Manzanar and the draft resisters of the Fair Play Committee at Heart Mountain, is beyond the study’s view. Her fine treatment of Ansel Adams’s Western work dissipates as she attempts to maneuver his brittle ego through the labyrinth of the Museum of Modern Art. There are generalizations here that should be removed. The differences among generational points of view could have occupied the additional space created by this excision in her otherwise tightly argued book. What happens when the memory of incarceration is now embodied by those who experienced
life in the “camp” as children? Even in her portrayal of the high school photographs, one can sense her frustration at testimonies that are, seemingly, upbeat.

These are quibbles about a book that gracefully navigates the space between academic and public discourse. The book’s last chapter in which the author engages the larger landscape of the “camps” and addresses the dynamics of generational memory is particularly promising.

University of Wyoming

Eric J. Sandeen


Although almost eighty years have passed since the first New Deal art projects were commissioned in America, the murals, photographs, prints, and sculptures that were created under the auspices of federal patronage continue to spur scholarly interest. In this insightful and amply illustrated study, Betsy Fahlman, professor of art history at Arizona State University, chronicles New Deal art production in Arizona from the mid-1930s to the mid-1940s, and considers how an “iconography of state identity” was shaped by various American artists (14).

Sponsored by the federal government and enacted at state and local levels, New Deal arts projects were especially intended as “work relief” measures: as projects aimed at employing, and keeping busy, Americans who might otherwise take to the streets to challenge established economic, political, and social norms. By extension, much New Deal art focused on engendering national unity by restoring confidence in American patterns of capitalism and democracy, and bolstering American assumptions about work and family. Images of strong, manly workers and the fruits of their labors, like the scenes of ranching, mining, and dam building depicted in Joseph Morgan Henninger’s 1934 mural Industrial Development in Arizona (featured on the cover), helped deflect Depression era anxieties about unemployment and undercut worries about the roles and responsibilities of masculine breadwinners. Photographs of subsistence-level farm workers, like Dorothea Lange’s pictures of migratory cotton pickers in Pinal County, documented hard times and helped make the case for New Deal relief measures in Arizona and throughout the United States.

Yet as Fahlman details, New Deal art in Arizona was often more complicated than these political/cultural mandates might suggest, and occasionally sparked controversy. The youngest of the 48 contingent states to join the union (in 1912), Arizona was known to outsiders as a tourist destination of stunning scenery, plentiful sunshine, and exotic Indians, especially as stereotyped in magazines like Arizona Highways (founded in 1921) and movies like John Ford’s Stagecoach (1939). Natives, however, understood that for all of Arizona’s natural grandeur and ancient history, copper and cotton dominated its economy and the federal government was its largest landowner. Artists who came to Arizona on various New Deal assignments juggled these multiple images and identities, sometimes reifying and sometimes challenging expectations. In 1939, for example, Seymour Fogel sketched an elegant scene of Southwest Indian dancers for a post office mural in Stafford, Arizona. Local Anglos harboring resentful memories of Apache raids, however, deemed Fogel’s design an “abomination,” and the artist substituted a stereotypical picture of wagon trains and pioneers (58).

Divided into chapters examining the development of art centers and museums, the production of specific murals and sculptures, and the circumstances that drove certain documentary photography projects, New Deal Art in Arizona importantly recounts the
The Rise of the Ku Klux Klan: Right-Wing Movements and National Politics.

This is a straightforward and useful study of the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s. McVeigh argues that this version of the Klan emerged as a white Protestant response to the rise of large-scale manufacturing and retail, which squeezed small businesses and farms, diminished the political influence of the heartland, and strengthened the power of the cities—and the ethnic communities that lived in them. The Klan’s explosive growth from 1920-24 was due to the success of Klan organizers in mobilizing WASPs who feared the devaluation of their economic, political, and social power as a result of these shifts.

McVeigh convincingly argues that social movement theory has difficulty explaining right-wing movements because it overlooks how threats to social status can be used to mobilize relatively privileged groups. Most social movements, he notes, seek to win power and status for the powerless. But right-wing movements “act to preserve, restore, or expand rights and privileges of a relatively advantaged social group” (38). The Klan is an example of this. They employed a populist rhetoric that condemned industrial elites above them for manipulating labor markets and attacked the “rabble” below them (i.e. ethnic, Catholic working class communities) for flooding these markets and for being culturally alien. The top and bottom of American society, they charged, conspired to squeeze the hard-working, upright, white Protestants in the middle.

McVeigh devises a “power devaluation” theory to explain why so many of this “virtuous middle” (Judith Shklar’s term in American Citizenship, Harvard University Press, 1991) were attracted to the Klan. Relatively privileged groups who fear the decline of their political, economic, and social “purchasing power” are susceptible to joining movements to defend it. White Protestants, for example, feared that their power was being devalued by the growing presence of Catholics and immigrants. The Klan mobilized anxious WASPs by presenting itself as a “one-hundred percent American” organization that promised to restore their standing. The power devaluation of these relatively privileged WASPs, combined with effective mobilization techniques by the Klan, led farmers and middle class white Protestants to join the KKK in droves.

McVeigh uses quantitative and qualitative data to examine the Klan at the national level, particularly a close content analysis of its major national newspaper, the Imperial Night-Hawk. His prose sometimes reads like stiff social science, but the book’s straightforward, non-moralistic tone is a strength. McVeigh takes the KKK seriously as a social movement and does so without feeling the need to constantly remind readers how evil they were.

McVeigh argues that while the 1920s Klan was racist, its focus was not on anti-Black terrorism like the Reconstruction-era KKK. (Its racism toward African Americans was primarily paternalistic, he maintains.) Rather, the 1920s Klan was essentially an anti-immigration organization. Through McVeigh one can see that its discourse is eerily similar to that of anti-immigration groups today. The KKK argued that “true Americans” were losing ground to immigrants, that immigrants burdened public resources, and that
they degraded American culture. These arguments—and many of the quotes McVeigh provides from Klan papers—could have come from the Minutemen today.

I have two criticisms of the book. First, McVeigh’s use of market metaphors to explain power devaluation underplays the role of struggle in political organizing. To speak of a “supply” of social status or a “decline in demand” of its “purchasing power” makes it seem like status is a commodity to be exchanged rather than a hierarchical relation of power negotiated through social conflict. Second, I wonder how generalizeable his power devaluation theory is. It seems like a promising model with which to interpret the contemporary anti-immigration movement and the “Tea Party” phenomenon, for example. But it is less clear how participants in anti-abortion, anti-gay marriage, abstinence-only education, creationism, and other evangelical Protestant movements are motivated by a perceived threat to their material interests or loss of social status. Their aim seems to be an ideal—the overthrow of secularism—at least as much as it is to restore lost standing. Perhaps power devaluation theory can explain these movements, but unfortunately McVeigh does not consider them in his final chapter on “Right-Wing Movements, Yesterday and Today.”

Regardless, this is an important work on a historical right-wing movement with clear applications for understanding tea parties and anti-immigrant movements today.

Northern Arizona University

Joel Olson


The poster of Gregory Peck and Audrey Hepburn scootering around Rome in William Wyler’s Roman Holiday (1953) has been a best seller in the Eternal City for years, probably decades. It has a lot to do with the Vespa they’re riding, of course, but Robert R. Shandley’s delightful and perceptive Runaway Romances offers a more complex understanding not only of that poster’s ongoing appeal, but of a genre of films he calls “travelogue romances,” appearing between 1947 and 1964. Most but not all of the films in the genre include a travelogue sequence; a woman who comes to Europe seeking renewal or self-discovery, often of a sexual kind; issues of social class; and the protagonist’s decision to return home (usually America) to “remain morally anchored” (56). Because the women at the center of these films were (like Frank and April Wheeler of Richard Yates’s Revolutionary Road [1961]) in flight from the comfortable, uninspiring boredom of America life, and because most of the films were made all or partly in Europe by troubled Hollywood studios in search of a new business model, Shandley refers to them as “runaway” films.

One of six chapters is given over to Roman Holiday (the “runaway princess” in a runaway film [39]), and another to explaining Hollywood’s new inclination to overseas production. A chapter subtitled “Metaphors of Transatlantic Relations” offers brief but revealing treatments of September Affair (1950), Indiscretion of an American Wife (David Lean, 1953), Summertime (1955) and Interlude (Douglas Sirk, 1957). Other chapters deal with the problems presented to the genre (e.g., in Three Coins in the Fountain [1954] and Hitchcock’s To Catch a Thief [1955]) by new widescreen technologies better suited to spectacle than narrative tension; changing ideas of the postwar occupation of Germany; and the decline of the genre as it turns dark (The Roman Spring of Mrs. Stone [1961]) and moves into self-reflexive parody (Paris, When It Sizzles [1964]).

Shandley’s solid grasp of the basics of filmmaking is apparent throughout, and he is a careful, credible, trustworthy reader of film narrative, often getting at meaning by
looking at how films create and solve problems. But Shandley is perhaps on less secure ground in claiming that the “project” of the runaway romance was “investigating the newly reconfigured relationship between Americans and Europeans” (xvi). To be sure, the German occupation films fit that description, but, as Shandley says, they make up a sub-genre, not quite the real thing. Elsewhere, he notes that the Europe offered in the genre is “one that has no intrinsic meaning itself. . . Europe and Europeans are not real” (69). Europe has meaning in these films, but it is meaning projected from afar, and meaning grounded, as Shandley’s film narratives and readings make clear, in the domestic frustrations and desires of postwar American women, who wanted a ride on that Vespa. That’s the main lesson of this thoughtful and engaging book.

State University of New York at Fredonia, Emeritus


Heather Nathans’ book tracks sentimental portrayals of African and slave characters on the American stage in 1787-61, which she argues challenged Thomas Jefferson’s sense that a ‘veil of black’ precluded interracial sympathy. Jefferson’s ‘veil’ differentiated black people from other Americans, and by implication prevented white people from empathising with them. Nathans finds a range of theatrical productions which showed black characters feeling, suffering, and arguing, plays which positively encouraged audiences to make a sympathetic identification with black speakers. This in an era in which recent scholarship has more often brought out ambivalent and disturbing aspects of racial representation on the stage, particularly in blackface minstrelsy. In another recent CUP book, Hazel Waters’ Racism on the Victorian Stage (2007), the theatre is more damaging than progressive.

Nathans shows that from the late eighteenth century onwards, the American theatre generated a substantial range of black characterization. Although very little of it was explicitly related to the abolition or colonization movements, discussions of race and slavery in the wider culture very quickly found expression and contention in the theatre. Moreover, the stage helped provide some of the language for these discussions: the famous example is the derivation of ‘Jim Crow’ from a dance act, but in the 1780s Isaac Bickerstaffe’s play The Padlock also engendered a slang term for a black person—Mungo.

The book traces important themes in these representations, particularly visions of African identity (including some of the earliest on-stage references to the Middle Passage) and violence. This includes both white fears of uprising—like the rest of American discussions of slavery after 1793, the drama seems to have been haunted by Haiti—and antislavery anxieties about the rape of enslaved women. Certain genres also emerge as significant: Nathans discusses a large number of plays in which the stage Yankee is paired with an African slave (from Jonathan Postfree in 1807 to Neighbor Jackwood in 1857). She shows that the development of the stage Yankee in this period, as he becomes an increasingly sympathetic, philanthropic figure, is intimately linked to the warmth of the character’s stage relationship with the slave. Black parts, are, by contrast, rare in Temperance drama, but in Aunt Dinah’s Pledge, the moral exemplar is a black mother, an intriguing development that Nathans links to a protest by Southern members of the Sons of Temperance against the inclusion of black marchers in a Boston parade. Some of the most fascinating discussion is of performance outside the theatre—abolitionist protests in churches, like Parker Pillsbury’s baptising of dogs, and Henry Ward Beecher’s ‘slave auctions’; or William C. Nell’s recreation of the Boston Massacre in a tableau at Faneuil Hall.
Nathans’ analysis tends to prioritise text over performance or reception, and tends not to consider the demands of genre (farce, afterpiece, melodrama) on the possibilities of representation, but her book demonstrates the wealth of the theatrical and performative commentary on race and slavery in this period, and outlines some significant developments in the course of it.

University of Cambridge (United Kingdom)  
Sarah Meer


When I first picked up this excellent book, I was unsure whether it had anything new to teach me. Gunn’s subject—the crystallization in the late 1940s and early 1950s of an alliance between (1) religious discourses about God and country (2) a permanent war economy linked to a policy of global military supremacy, and (3) extravagant pro-capitalism and anti-socialism in most non-military sectors of the economy—seems on first impression to be old hat for American Studies scholars, and Gunn tends to presuppose a consensus approach to US culture that has long been out of favor. Moreover, Gunn is not a conventional scholar of US history and religion; although he holds a Religious Studies Ph.D from Harvard, recently he has worked as a lawyer associated with the American Civil Liberties Union. Although he cites a solid mix of scholars, readers of this journal may sometimes find him thin on pre-1940s historical contexts and traditions of critiquing US empire. He does little to clarify how his stress on change in the 1940s intersects with a wider historiography, nor how his account of the role of religion within these changes differs from other scholarly treatments. Thus I initially wondered if Gunn had set out to reinvent the wheel.

I am happy to report that, in fact, the results are far more impressive. By approaching from a different angle than most scholars and concentrating on a new interpretation of primary sources (mainly journalistic coverage and government documents, some recently declassified), Gunn achieves a fresh and dynamic new interpretation of this crucial topic—an important intervention into ongoing debates.

After an introductory section, Gunn offers three strong chapters documenting the surging importance of civil religion, militarism, and capitalism in the decade after 1945. Using vivid examples, he dramatizes changes from an earlier historical baseline and the effects of these changes on cultural discourse and political-economic policy. For example, he shows how expectations of rapid military demobilization after 1945 (as happened after World War I) gave way to a permanent war economy, and how earlier religious voices promoting peace and moderate socialism (including a 1940s commission chaired by John Foster Dulles and a chapter in The Fundamentals) became marginalized in a frenzy of flag-waving, ostentatious public prayers, and Christian capitalism.

Importantly, Gunn offers two rich case studies to document the consequences of his themes. One chapter treats the 1954 overthrow of Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala and another the rise and fall of Ngo Dinh Diem in Vietnam. The Guatemala chapter brilliantly demonstrates how Gunn’s themes intersect, and is written with a concreteness and rhetorical skill that would make it a fine introduction for students into critical thinking about news media. The Vietnam chapter is especially noteworthy for shining a light on the religious dimensions of Diem’s rise to power. Diem was a protégé of Cardinal Spellman with a base among Vietnamese Catholics, and there was a strong Christian vs. Buddhist aspect to his government’s failure. Meanwhile, religion was central to the discourse about the war inside the US—dramatized by such things as the lionization of Thomas Dooley as
the public face of US intervention and the way that the self-immolation of the Buddhist monk, Thich Quang Duc, galvanized antiwar protest. Gunn makes it clear that religious aspects of anti-Communism in Vietnam—and also, by extension, in related places like Korea—deserve greater attention than most scholars have given them.

Tradeoffs are implicit in Gunn’s method, as in any scholarly approach. His stress on the forging of a hegemonic coalition in the world of elite politics, economics, and media takes the focus off ongoing disagreements—before, during, and after the period in focus—as well as precedents on which his emerging coalition built. Some scholars will desire more attention to labor and working class history, compared to the usable past that Gunn highlights, as well as to earlier forms of militarism and empire, which he downplays through his stress on changes after 1940. Other will wish for greater nuance in Gunn’s stress on how evangelicals were less militaristic before the late 1940s. He establishes that there was a hawkish shift worth noting—a non-trivial contribution. Nevertheless, among the thin parts of Gunn’s bibliography is scholarship that dramatizes continuities with earlier evangelical hawkishness (e.g., on William Bell Riley, Aimee Semple McPherson, or the Old Christian Right). Insofar as the moral leverage behind Gunn’s critique depends on it being grounded in a viable religious alternative, centering this usable past among evangelicals is more of a mixed bag than Gunn seems to think. Conversely, the ongoing presence, throughout the century, of critique from the Catholic and mainline Protestant left is more important than he acknowledges.

Many of these trade-offs result, for better and for worse, from Gunn’s focus on policy debates and on elites who have held the levers of power since 1945. He clearly wants more political and media leaders to question the status quo—but he asks where these leaders are, exactly. Are not most mainstream politicians—including in the Democratic Party—fully enmeshed in the threefold system that Gunn describes? Anyone who wishes to add greater nuance to Gunn’s account must first grapple with the legacies he documents. Thus, despite my initial hesitations and the trade-offs I have mentioned, by the time I put down Gunn’s book it had thoroughly won me over. I recommend it highly, not solely as a teaching text, but also for scholars in history, American Studies, religious studies, and public policy who would like a fresh perspective on these critically important matters.

University of Tennessee

Mark Hulsether


Meticulously researched and written in a lively and engaging style, Mia Bay’s intellectual biography of Ida B. Wells is a much-needed and welcome addition to the extant scholarly literature on the activist once declared “the most widely known woman of her race in the world” (3). Taking up her own critique of Patricia Schechter’s seminal 2001 book on Wells, Bay departs from conventional treatments of Wells as a Progressive reformer, offering the reader an analysis of the leader that not only uncovers the “puzzle of her personality,” but also accounts for her “militant” activism. Bay presents a nuanced reading of the politics of racial uplift to argue convincingly that Wells “drew on forms of antebellum politics that survived the Civil War,” most notably, the “tradition of noisy public protest” of abolitionists (10-11) that placed her at odds with early twentieth century black leaders, clubwomen, activists, and institutions more interested in cultivating white allies than in engaging “radical” activism.

Born a slave in 1862 in Holly Springs, Mississippi, Wells was reared by two parents who instilled “race pride,” Christian values, and the importance of education in their
children. At age sixteen, Ida was forced to become an adult when her parents died of yellow fever. To provide for herself and her five siblings she worked as a teacher and a freelance writer/journalist, eventually relocating to Memphis, Tennessee. A witness to the successes of Radical Reconstruction, Wells resented Southern “Redemption” and Jim Crow’s circumscription of black freedom, a resentment that inspired her two failed anti-discrimination railroad lawsuits. Yet, as Bay notes, it was her public reaction to the lynching of her friend Thomas Moss and subsequent exile from Memphis that thrust Wells unto the national and international stage. A relentless crusader, Wells exposed the “racial fictions” used to justify racial terror aimed at blacks. She revealed that lynching “was not about rape or even sex; it was about power” (122). Bay’s riveting narrative of Wells’ crusade that took her from Memphis to London lays bare the “lasting impact” she had on transatlantic reform.

Perhaps the most novel contribution of Bay’s biography is its depiction of Wells as the “living link between the abolitionist tradition…and the twentieth century civil rights activism of the NAACP” (318). Above all else, Wells’ uncompromising dedication to racial justice inherited from her parents undergirded her commitment to antilynching, equal suffrage, and desegregation. Her “spirited and often impulsive activism” (295) associated with “old-fashioned radicals” (321) alienated her from organizations such as the NAACP (which she co-founded), NACW, Afro-American League, and the Negro Fellowship League. Ironically, Wells “was written out of the black protest tradition by a new generation of reformers who appropriated her ideas while rejecting her leadership” (318).

Bay’s Wells is an extraordinary and complex leader, who dared “to tell the truth freely” in an era when the majority of African Americans could not.

University of Nebraska, Lincoln   Jeannette Eileen Jones


Neither What Virtue There is in Fire nor Lynching and Spectacle is a ‘traditional’ study of lynching; they do not grapple with its origins, its underlying causes, or its geographical particularity.

They are instead concerned with representations of lynching and with the power of these representations to fuel, justify and, in the case of Wood, suppress mob violence. In this sense, they build upon the important work of historians, such as Christopher Waldrep, who have pointed to the importance of analyzing language and rhetoric in tracing the rise and fall of ‘Judge Lynch.’

In his study, Edwin T. Arnold examines the notorious burning of Sam Hose, accused of murdering his white employer in Georgia in 1899. He places this event in the context of both smoldering local race relations, including the massacre weeks before of a group of black men in a neighboring town, and of racial conflict at the state, national, and international levels. He points out, for example, that the United States was engaged in a blatantly racist war in the Philippines and that white Georgians were clashing regularly with the black soldiers being trained in their state. With his attention to these layers of context, Arnold largely avoids some of the problems that afflict many lynching case studies—namely, excessive local detail that contributes little to the larger theoretical and methodological concerns.
Arnold pays particular attention to the competing narratives that emerged from the Hose lynching, mining them to reveal how flagrantly the same ‘facts’ were manipulated by commentators—blacks, whites, northerners, southerners—to condemn or justify the violence. He is particularly effective in his discussion of the role of white newspapers in the creation of sensational narratives which not only reflected but also nourished white anger over alleged black criminality. “I am fascinated with the audacious vocabulary, the melodramatic verve, the bold disregard for ‘truth’ in many of these accounts,” he notes. “Papers contradicted themselves from one day to the next, or even within the columns of the same page, with a kind of boisterous indifference” (6).

Arnold is, perhaps, at his best when he considers the continued appropriation of Sam Hose today. Though his argument might make some uncomfortable, he makes a persuasive case that historians have swapped the simplistic narrative of white victimization and black criminality which filled newspapers a century ago for an equally simplistic and dangerous narrative about black victims without agency. “[The] desire to redeem Hose from racist constructions comes at a price,” he notes. “In effect, Sam Hose has . . . been denied his ‘voice,’ his capacity for action, as he is changed from active to passive participant in the drama of his death. While he could once be pictured as a revolutionary, an insurgent fighting against an oppressive and vicious system, today he all too often seems mostly a sad victim of very bad luck” (189).

In Lynching and Spectacle, Wood argues that “it was the spectacle of lynching, rather than the violence itself, that wrought psychological damage, that enforced black acquiescence to white domination” (2). She contends that lynching constituted a ritual enactment of white supremacy which created and sustained the impression of white racial superiority and unity for black and white observers alike. She further argues that spectators did not simply consume lynchings passively but actively engaged in them, ‘witnessing’ them in ways which created bonds of belonging and community among the witnesses. Wood focuses on a broad range of cultural spectacles, including public executions, religious rituals, photographic images, and motion pictures.

Beginning at the local level in the South, she shows that lynching photographs—intended for a largely local audience, or for friends around the country—initially reinforced the racist assumptions of lynch mobs themselves, acting as a sort of ‘folk pornography’ which offered like-minded white ‘witnesses’ “vicarious access to the missed thrill of the lynching” (81). However, she demonstrates clearly that these same images, intended to justify lynching, ultimately spelled its undoing when they circulated nationally. “The ideological significance of these images—that is, their capacity to substantiate white supremacist views—depended on . . . specific contextualizing or personal signification,” she writes. “As antilynching advocates well knew, once these photographs were removed from these contexts, entirely new meanings could be imprinted on them” (108-109). Whereas lynching supporters used these photographs to show the depravity of black victims and the manly virility of the white avengers, black activists used these same images to show the depravity of the lynchers and the martyrdom of innocent black victims to racism. “On the pages of the black press, these images no longer served as visual testimonies of white unity and superiority but instead as graphic and indisputable symbols of white brutality and racial injustice” (188).

In her challenging book, Wood provides a wealth of interesting and provocative insights. Like others, she finds that, popular perceptions notwithstanding, spectacle lynchings were not the province of the countryside but flared in newly urbanizing places where race, class, and gender relations were in flux and where whites most acutely feared black criminality. However, she also shows that, even as they rebelled against the rapid
changes which were altering social relations, white southerners incorporated analogous changes into the lynching spectacle itself. “Even as lynching represented a revolt against modernity and its effects, lynch mobs made use of new modes of spectacle to enact and perpetuate their violence,” (11) she writes. In addition to the irony evident in the dissemination of lurid narratives in the daily press, the snapping of photographs of the lynch scene, and even the hanging of victims from telephone poles, the author notes that this irony was particularly evident in early films that glorified lynchings. “These films deployed modern visual technology and its sensationalistic and objectifying capacity in order to uphold antimodern forms of social power. In a sense, they enabled people to use modernity against itself” (118).

In sum, these studies contribute in significant ways to our understanding of the importance of narrative and representation to mob violence and should be essential reading for scholars in this important field of study.

BEAUTY SHOP POLITICS: African American Women=s Activism in the Beauty Industry.
By Tiffany M. Gill. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 2010

In Beauty Shop Politics Tiffany M. Gill argues concisely and convincingly that the beauty industry facilitated the political activism of beauty culturists as they gained economic autonomy through hairdressing and product sales within black communities. The book, which covers the entire span of the twentieth century, complements a sizable body of historical literature on the rise of the beauty industry and the unique place of African American women in that industry. Gill explores the paradox and the dilemma that de facto and legalized segregation, North and South, provided an opportunity for the flowering of African American businesses, among which beauty proved major in the millions of dollars it generated and the numbers of women for whom it provided a livelihood. She also demonstrates that, although segregation provided a niche for the African American industry, the successes of the civil rights movement did not close African American beauticians out of the trade. White entrepreneurs successfully entered into the manufacture of African American beauty products, but intra-racial preferences and persistent discrimination kept white beauticians out of black beauty shops and African American patrons loyal to practitioners of their own race.

Gill documents beauticians= participation and leadership in protest and rights advocacy from the Garvey movement through health improvement campaigns at the turn of the twenty-first century. Gill is at her strongest in showing throughout that beauticians engaged in gender politics alongside racial politics as women confronted gender role expectations within the black community as they grappled simultaneously with the challenges of minority life in America. She shows that the beauty shop both catered to women=s hair styling demands and provided a haven from African American women=s battles with the world outside the salon.

She brings to light the significant political contributions of lesser-known beautician activists like Adina Stewart and Mamie Garvin Fields. Organizations of beauticians stressed the importance of political rights and mobilized beauticians to work for civil rights and for individual electoral candidates. The last two chapters of the book, which follow beauticians from the civil rights movement through the challenges of the Hurricane Katrina calamity and of the Obama election campaign, bring the most new information to light.
Sources for the study of the African American beauty trade are vast in number, but they are widely dispersed and often hidden inside collections on other topics. Gill has been adept and thorough in plumbing the sources. Tiffany Gill has made a major contribution to our understanding that the beauty industry has been central to African American women’s search for economic sufficiency and the struggle for all African Americans’ political rights. The one area that Gill might have developed more fully is the important role that beauticians played in encouraging and supporting secondary and higher education for minority women, the luxury of which many had been themselves deprived. Nonetheless, if I were to recommend one book to read on the history of the African American beauty industry, this would be the one.

Texas A&M University, College Station


Charles Eames, Florence Knoll, Eero Saarinen—these names are synonymous with America’s heyday in modern design. Yet, as Greg Castillo convincingly argues in Cold War on the Home Front (2010), these designers also were key weapons in America’s Cold War arsenal. While foundational studies like Elaine Tyler May’s Homeward Bound (1988) and Karal Ann Marling’s As Seen on TV (1996) demonstrate how Cold War foreign policy trickled down and into suburban America’s domestic spaces, Castillo’s captivating text contends that domesticity was a central mechanism for and front upon which the United States and Soviet Union struggled to sell their respective ideologies abroad. Focusing on Berlin, Castillo demonstrates how postwar Germany was a key test market for American and Soviet propaganda with design typifying Cold War struggles to define and delimit “home”—literal domiciles, national identities, political systems, and individual selves. Yet, Castillo’s book argues that design’s propagandistic efficacy coupled with the frenetic rebranding of “democratic” and “socialist” design ultimately came back to haunt both Americans and Soviets, such that this book offers “a cautionary tale” on the power of the ideological soft-sell (xxiv).

Castillo’s book begins with Nixon and Khrushchev’s much discussed “Kitchen Debate” (1959), but then moves back in time to illustrate how that moment was but a late incarnation of a long-standing foreign policy debate over design. The book exposes the roots of the Kitchen Debate in the Marshall Plan’s efforts to design a democratic ideal abroad; in the planning of postwar Germany’s reconstruction; in West and East German design schools as they wrestled with movements among and between Bauhaus, minimalist, modernist, and social realist design; and in ideologically driven design shows—shows like the United States’ “We’re Building A Better Life” (1952) and the Soviet Union’s “Live Better—More Beautifully” (1953). National and international leaders equated particular modes of consumption with political affiliation—how one lived signaled who one was. Yet, Castillo demonstrates that West Germany’s Hochschule für Gestaltung and East Germany’s Bauakademie schools’ distinctive aesthetics (modernism and Stalinist neotraditionalism/social realism, respectively) increasingly blurred as the U.S. and Soviet Union perpetually repackaged their design philosophy. Things like America’s “People’s Capitalism” exhibit (1956), targeting the working-class and the Soviet Union’s argument that mass consumption and “Abundance for All” was the fulfillment of Marx’s vision, complicated efforts to ideologically restructure Germany as a model of “Democracy” or “Communism.” Indeed, as Castillo reveals, these battles succeeded in creating not political but consumer republics—on the one hand, manufacturing feelings of entitlement and
raising consumer expectations that planted the seeds for the economic implosion bringing down the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the U.S.S.R. in 1991, and on the other hand, undermining American ideals of “freedom” by so successfully linking such with consumption so that self-indulgence became a mark of national identity and pride.

Greg Castillo’s well-researched and written book successfully compliments and extends existing studies of domesticity’s politics during the Cold War. In so doing, it offers a new way to understand American and Soviet efforts to design ideal structures within which to house competing ideologies. Castillo’s archival research is extensive, his scope is sufficiently narrow, and his tone is balanced as he recognizes the victories and limits on both sides of the Cold War divide. While those interested in design will benefit most from this study, its interdisciplinary scope and accessible language make it a pleasure to read for all those interested in the form of ideology and ideology of form as it dominated the Cold War.

Brigham Young University


Peter Dorsey’s Common Bondage adeptly demonstrates how the metaphor of slavery drove America’s rhetorical engine during the Revolutionary era. Used in pamphlets, newspapers, sermons, plays, correspondence, poetry, and public documents by Patriots and Royalists, by blacks and whites, and by men and women, the slavery metaphor powerfully shaped the way people thought about liberty, independence from Great Britain, and the condition of slaves and women. Dorsey contends that before and during the war for independence all sides believed that American independence and emancipation of slaves “were irrevocably joined” (xvii). However, shortly after independence was achieved, Dorsey shows how the universal motivation for emancipation dissipated despite growing efforts of abolitionists in both the North and South.

Patriots used the slavery metaphor to draw upon the Whig political tradition that warned of the danger of unchecked governmental power. The perceived danger to liberty was heightened because of the presence of chattel slavery. Whigs believed that liberty and property were inexorably connected, and that every attempt by government to take property unjustly would end in slavery. It took little time for Britain’s new imperial policy initiated after 1763 to be interpreted by Americans as the harbinger of slavery.

Part of the property Americans wanted protected was their slaves, even though virtually everyone saw the inconsistency of staving off British slavery while they themselves owned slaves. While some individuals worked hard to couple their own freedom with abolitionism, others strove to separate the two. The emphasis on property rights helped blurr this inconsistency partly by emphasizing racial distinctions that would lay the foundation for the proslavery rhetoric of the next generation. The postwar secularization of society, with its emphasis on the separation of church and state, also undercut the effectiveness of abolitionists’ use of the slavery metaphor.

The slavery metaphor was used in a variety of other ways—to encourage individual and national economic independence, to show that humans were subject to the slavery of sin, to emphasize the importance of manly fortitude as opposed to effeminacy in defending one’s rights, by women challenging the patriarchal authority of their husbands, by Royalists discrediting the Patriot cause, and by black ministers and writers (Phillis Wheatley and Benjamin Bannecker to mention two) who pointed to the time (either here on earth or in the hereafter) when roles would be reversed and slaves would become masters and
masters would become slaves. In the debate over the newly proposed Constitution in 1787—1788, Antifederalists incorporated the slavery metaphor into their overall strategy, aligning themselves with the principles of the American Revolution and condemning Federalists as advocates of a new oppressive imperial government. Federalists, on the other hand, emphasized compromise, Union, and their own enlightened, rational thinking as opposed to the passion and radicalism of their opponents.

Dorsey has collected a prodigious number of quotations using the slavery metaphor. He divides these topically among his eight chapters and weaves these quotations together in a masterful narrative that captures much of the emotion of the day. He would have felt comfortable as an actual participant in the Revolutionary debates.

University of Wisconsin-Madison
John P. Kaminski


For political scientists, journalists, and the public, Greg Koger’s Filibustering is a most timely book. Congressional scholars have emphasized the growth of Senate filibusters for the past twenty years; journalists, such as the Washington Post’s Ezra Klein, have given it substantial and sophisticated attention; and the public has grown increasingly aware of the Senate’s pivotal role in policy-making, especially in light of the 60 votes needed to pass major legislation like health care.

Greg Koger has written a book that will not end debates over the filibuster, but it will allow anyone who reads it to enter the debate with the best possible background on the use of delay as a tactic in congressional politics. For most legislative scholars there are few big surprises in this book; its value for them is Koger’s careful, systematic approach to filibustering (defined as the purposeful use of delaying tactics) over the course of congressional history. Building on the work of Steven Smith, Sarah Binder, Greg Wawro, and Eric Schickler, Koger constructs a meticulous database of delaying tactics across both chambers and the entire 220 years of congressional politics.

Future scholars will certainly use Koger’s database and will contest some of his conclusions, which generally paint delay as part of the fabric of Capitol Hill politics and perhaps not quite as anti-democratic as many contemporary critics would conclude.

For historians and other students of American politics, Filibustering will constitute a standard reference into the use of legislative delay. Koger notes that through the 19th century the most serious instances of filibustering came in the House, and only with the Speakership of Thomas Reed (circa 1890) is the problem addressed. Within a few years, both parties have agreed that the House will become a majority-driven institution.

In the 20th century, the politics of delay become centered in the Senate. For most Americans, including most sophisticated journalists and laypersons, the idea of filibustering is shaped by Mr. Smith Goes to Washington and the momentous civil rights filibusters of the 1950s and 1960s. This means exhausted senators, cots in the anteroom, and endless speeches that often drift toward irrelevant topics. While there are more than a few grains of truth in these images, Koger systematically paints a far more detailed and nuanced picture.

Using a painstakingly created data set of all filibusters in the Senate, Koger develops a broad argument that emphasizes how Senate rules and the growth of the chamber’s workload combine to explain much of the patterns of delaying activity, including the rise of filibusters and cloture votes in recent years. Embedded in this analysis is his conclu-
sion that delay is a systematic element of legislative politics, manifested especially in the Senate over the past century.

Koger develops a basic, and reasonably straightforward, theoretical model of delay and applies it across the full scope of American legislative history. Using a cost-benefit model, he assesses the actions of both those who want to pass legislation and those who would obstruct it. Although he does some reasonably sophisticated data analysis, this is a book that can be read by anyone interested in filibustering. American studies scholars should take a book like this to heart, in that it demonstrates both the strengths of institutional analysis, as well as the limitations. Koger makes no direct, wholesale points about the normative elements of delay in American politics. But he does provide a combination of first-rate social science and historical analyses that should make scholars from many disciplines reexamine the role of filibusters in American politics, and more generally, the impact of institutional design and change.

In short, although the topic seems one of limited interest, it actually should be read closely by all those who are interested in how Americans govern themselves.

University of Kansas


Propaganda, it seems, is one of the twentieth century’s dirty words. In For Home and Country, Celia Malone Kingsbury traces that association to World War One, where governments bombarded their citizens with various media designed to demonize the enemy and stamp out obstruction at home—all with unprecedented sophistication, distribution, and impact. So far, so familiar; but Malone’s book intervenes by presenting a remarkable archive of novels, posters, stories, games, recipes, movies, adverts and postcards that demonstrates how the home was the key location in both symbolic and practical terms for encouraging belligerent populations to think and act in concert.

Malone organises that archive through its various target audiences. Drawing mainly from American and British sources, her first chapter examines campaigns targeting housewives and mothers, especially the U.S. Food Administration’s publicity drive urging the conservation of essential foodstuffs. Malone deftly examines how domestic science, the state, advertisers, and magazines transformed the kitchen into a key site of national formation and economy, and the conflicts that arose between its various functions of consumption, nurturance, and patriotism. Chapters two and three consider young women and girls, primarily how they were solicited for Red Cross and the British Voluntary Aid Detachment (VAD) work through wartime fiction. Certain stereotypes predominate: the narrow-minded, often wealthy, unpatriotic woman who will not curb her consumption to assist the nation’s cause; the self-sacrificing and often bereaved (or even martyred) heroine, frequently Belgian or French, struggling to protect her ravaged home; the flighty volunteer who grows into mature womanhood through working as a nurse; the plucky tomboy who participates physically in defeating German invaders or foiling Teutonic spies. Chapter four examines how children’s books and games encouraged children to donate money to the war effort, conserve food, and report “suspicious” behaviour. And chapter five examines how propaganda targeted at men utilised the home; homes were shown as imperilled sites that deserved men’s protection, but also as containing wives and mothers coercively expectant that their menfolk would do their patriotic duty.

Readers will appreciate the thoroughness of Malone’s archival research, and the reproduction of so many images of WWI propaganda. Yet they might also wish for more
nuanced analysis of this fascinating archive. There is little sense of how propaganda works as much by institution as by image, for example. Similarly, the complexity of how individuals relate to their governments and states in wartime, uncovered in the recent work on WWI and citizenship by historians such as Kimberly Jensen, Christopher Capozzola, and Jennifer Keene, goes unmentioned. This leads Malone (who also largely ignores the significance of the voluntary institutions—unions, churches, special interest groups, lodges, and women’s clubs—that were such a feature of Progressive America) into an often reductive theoretical divide between the authentic bonds of community on one hand, and the coercive and duplicitous demands of the state on the other. Stating that “the manipulation of public information, or any information, is negative”—a judgement which leads her to identify George Creel, the head of the CPI, as “one of history’s villains”—her book does little to suggest how citizens reacted variously to this propaganda, or expressed agency in wartime; or, indeed, what a ‘neutral’ standard of public information might look like (266, 263). Her agentless and irresistible characterisation of propaganda aside, this will be important reading for scholars of World War One in America, and those interested in popular fiction in the early 20th century.

University of Exeter

Mark Whalan


This collection includes seventeen new essays by anthropologists and sociologists, nearly all hailing from leading universities on the U.S. East and West Coasts. Their topic is a feeling of insecurity that is increasingly prevalent among Americans, its sources and manifestations. Together, they marshal impressive evidence of recent, real-world bouts with appalling adversity in their own experience or their family’s, among census-tracked subalterns, acquaintances or fieldwork subjects whose struggles would overwhelm lesser mortals. Starting the count (imprecisely and a bit too conveniently) with the 1970s, the end of the Cold War, or the Presidency of George W. Bush, just about everything seems to be getting worse—or at least risky—for everyone except a narrower and narrower elite.

All that suffering seems especially inexcusable because its causes are so familiar and so readily named. (In fact, it is also bit discouraging that the authors rarely acknowledge the many, long traditions of both popular and scholarly criticism in which their work fits. Jeremiads are at least as predictable in cultural studies, pop psychology and sociology as they once were among Puritans; so, it is odd to see that connection effaced.) And it is certainly possible to turn the moral of these stories in a positive direction, from damnation to conviction. They could counsel, not a look on the bright side, but concrete steps toward remedies—as the subtitle promises, “what we should do about it.” But few specific suggestions are even mentioned. The authors could have begun with their own jobs, working to brighten the lives of university students, or with their own activism, steering citizen groups toward a better world. The bulk of what finds its way into these essays, however, comes closer to doom and gloom: more bathos than manifesto or jeremiad or even pathos. To hear most of the authors tell it, their own company mysteriously excluded, the U.S. is and, if justice prevails, should be going to hell in a hand basket.

These specific perspectives were first workshopped at MIT in 2006, then previewed in DC, as a “standing-room-only panel” at the 2007 meeting of the American Anthropological Association. They now appear as fully formed essays in a handsome University
of California paperback. The cover photo invites a viewer to a long jump at the end of a short pier.

Inside, the volume opens with a celebrity endorsement by Barbara Ehrenreich and an introduction by editors Hugh Gusterson (George Mason University) and Catherine Besteman (Colby College). They promise a social-science overview of the sorry state of current affairs. The essays are grouped around themes that, in varying proportion, anchor nearly every essay: inequality, militarism, deindustrialization, materialism, racism, nativism, xenophobia, neoliberalism, outsourcing, offshoring, neoconservatism, unilateralism . . . all supposedly distinctly “new” and “American.”

Whatever the specific stimulus, the response, the authors and editors agree, is an unprecedented level of insecurity at-large, but none of them addresses their disagreements about its justification. In some chapters, the feeling appears to originate in delusion propagated by corporations or right-wing ideologues for their own benefit; in others, it is a reasonable, necessary, or even understated response to systematic engines of degradation, suffering and death. In any case, lest the list of reasons to feel insecure remains too short, readers can now add the insecurity craze to their reasons for feeling insecure. Significant caveats, inconsistencies, disagreements, or questions for future research are generally for readers to find on their own.

Each chapter focuses on a destabilizing aspect of institutions, everyday life, and larger world systems that are subject to elite Americans’ lead. Each may be distinct, but at bottom they remain supposedly “American” (and chiefly for that reason also going global), cruel in consequence (if not also design), and new.

What is it, exactly, that gives “us” the heebie-jeebies? Each contributor targets a variant:

- Setha Low (CUNY): “A Nation of Gated Communities”
- Catherine Lutz (Brown): “Warmaking as the American Way of Life”
- Roger Lancaster (GMU): “Republic of Fear: The Rise of Punitive Governance in America”
- David Graeber (London): “Neoliberalism, or The Bureaucratization of the World”
- Jane Collins (UW-Madison): “The Age of Wal-Mart”
- Christine Walley (MIT): “Deindustrializing Chicago: A Daughter’s Story”
- Joseph Dumit (UCD): “Normal Insecurities, Healthy Insecurities”
- Juliet Schor (BC): “Cultivating Insecurity: How Marketers are Commercializing Childhood”
- T. M. Luhrmann (Stanford): “Uneasy Street”
- Brett Williams (AU): “Body and Soul: Profits from Poverty”
- Philippe Bourgois (UPenn): “Useless Suffering: The War on Homeless Drug Addicts”
- Peter Kwong (CUNY): “Walling Out Immigrants”
- Jamine Wedel (GMU): “Compounding Insecurity: What the Neocon Core Reveals about America Today”
- Susan Hirsch (GMU): “Deploying Law as a Weapon in America’s War on Terror”
Readers who follow contemporary cultural criticism will find little here that is objectionable or, for that matter, new. They probably will find most chapters a fair-'nough summary of conventional wisdom among progressive friends on-campus, too. The chapters by Hirsch, Harding, Dumit, and especially Walley deserve special commendation for their good sense, the breadth and precision of their observations, and the grace with which they are conveyed.

Most generalizations and supporting citations, however, rarely stray far from the Blue-State side of the Times list of non-fiction bestsellers. In fact, there are a remarkably few citations from refereed journals or monographs (not to mention the canon of the Heritage Foundation, the American Enterprise Institute and Fox News, as compared to The Washington Post, The Christian Science Monitor, or The New Yorker). Seymour Hersh and Michael Moore are quoted as authorities while neo-cons are dismissed as nuts. In general, I share the authors’ bias, but I also think this stacking of the deck is unlikely to convince anyone who does not already agree.

For teaching purposes, then, this book would benefit from several sorts of supplements: readings that contextualize the observations against a larger span of history, a larger (and less nation-centered) geography, and a longer, more nuanced tradition of cultural criticism. At the very least, within an American Studies class it would be helpful to unpack the presumption that moral failings have exceptional sting when found in America.

Coastal Institute, University of Rhode Island; University of Iowa, Emeritus Richard P. Horwitz


“The honor of my race, family & self is at stake,” wrote Jack Trice the night before his 1923 debut as the first African American football player at Iowa State University. The next day, Trice endured serious injuries—perhaps from racially charged, overaggressive white tacklers—and he soon died. The incident revealed both the burdens and obstacles faced by early black athletes at predominately white institutions. In Integrating the Gridiron, Lane Demas recognizes these hurdles while also painting a richer, more nuanced portrait of how race shaped college football.

If popular history creates heroes out of single, professional black athletes overcoming their sport’s racial barriers, Demas seeks to move “beyond Jackie Robinson.” In four case studies that cover a broad geographic range and span from the late 1930s to the early 1970s, he illustrates a diversity of responses to touchstone moments in the integration of college football, complicating any easy triumph-over-adversity narrative.

Ironically, in moving “beyond Jackie Robinson,” Demas begins with Robinson’s football team at UCLA, which had four other black players, as well, including the stars Kenny Washington and Woody Strode. In the late 1930s and early 1940s, UCLA rejected the “gentleman’s agreement” that dictated the benching of black athletes in competitions against all-white teams. Black Los Angelinos and the African American press adopted UCLA as their own team, reading political significance into these racially integrated, high-performing squads.
Demas then turns to Johnny Bright, a star black halfback for Drake University in Iowa, who in 1951 suffered a broken jaw after a deliberate, premeditated attack on the first play of a game against all-white Oklahoma A&M. It not only elicited universal condemnation in Iowa, but also earned criticism in Oklahoma—though in terms of “poor sportsmanship,” not racism, suggesting one way that race got muted in the supposedly apolitical sports arena.

When Georgia Governor Marvin Griffin banned Georgia Tech from playing the University of Pittsburgh (which had one black player, a backup fullback) in the 1956 Sugar Bowl, it represented “massive resistance” in the South after the Brown decision. But it provoked outrage among not only racial liberals, but also white college students in Atlanta and beyond. While southern football fans pleaded that the Sugar Bowl had nothing to do with politics, it nevertheless exposed cracks in the segregationists’ guard.

Yet in 1969, when fourteen black players at the University of Wyoming elected to wear black armbands against Brigham Young University to protest the racist practices of the Church of Latter Day Saints, Coach Lloyd Eaton kicked them off the team. Culturally threatened by Black Power, whites in Wyoming endorsed Eaton’s decision, even though it essentially sacrificed the team’s chances for success.

Well-researched and accessible, Integrating the Gridiron urges an understanding of multiple perspectives at the intersection of race and sport. Yet it resembles an excellent dissertation more than a mature book. Some sections on historiography and historical context seem unnecessary. A few more case studies, perhaps stretching the scope to encompass the entire twentieth century, could have fulfilled the promise suggested by these insightful analyses.

University of Memphis
Aram Goudsouzian


For more than twenty years, social and political historians of the early American republic have employed the term market revolution to describe the rapid economic and social transformations that the United States underwent between the Revolution and the Civil War. Introduced by Sean Wilentz, Charles Sellers, and others, the concept has been challenged by scholars including Daniel Walker Howe and Daniel Feller; indeed, this reviewer has expressed skepticism about it. But a generation of historians now has employed the term constructively as a device with which to think about the dramatic changes of the period, their character and causes. Many of them published their work in the Journal of the Early Republic, of which for ten years John Lauritz Larson was co-editor. Larson, also author of two previous books and many articles on American economic history, has now contributed this volume to the Cambridge University Press “Essential Histories” series, aimed at providing critical introductions to major historical themes. He offers a fine, clear, lively, and thought-provoking overview of his topic that is not only the best now available but likely to survive the test of time.

While acknowledging that the concept of a Market Revolution has been subject to warm debate, Larson avoids getting bogged down in the particulars; for readers wishing to delve further he indicates some of the major points of contention and provides a good bibliographical essay. Nevertheless, he offers a clear rationale for employing the term. Over this period, he suggests, market dealings, connections, and dependencies, once associated with mercantile capitalism, spread to shape everyday life for most “ordinary”
Americans. Responsiveness to markets and their demands also promoted the technical, organizational, and social changes that fostered territorial expansion, commercialized agriculture, manufacturing developments, transportation improvements, urbanization, and new methods of finance. By the 1850s, Larson suggests, the elements of U.S. capitalism had largely fallen into place. In broad but precise brushstrokes, Larson delineates the different elements and regional characteristics of these changes, and captures contemporaries’ sense of the breathtaking pace at which they seemed to occur. He also notes key interconnections, for instance between commercial growth, the spread of newspapers (carriers inter alia of commercial information), and developments in paper making.

Larson demonstrates why economic and development issues were at the heart of U.S. political activity and debate during the period. Unlike some earlier exponents of a Market Revolution thesis, he interprets political conflicts not as between “forward-looking” and “backward-looking” groups, but between exponents of centrally-conceived and guided programs, such as Henry Clay’s “American system” of federally-funded internal improvements, and those of “individualism, localism, and libertarianism” (22), who supplied much of the energy behind nineteenth-century developments and helped unleash a “steady privatization of economic life” (23). Among the book’s strengths is its introduction to the different traditions in economic theory, from Adam Smith and his critics onwards, that influenced both contemporary political debates and historical interpretations of the Market Revolution and its characteristics. Larson traces in this nineteenth-century transformation not only the economic and social changes and disruptions he outlines, but what his subtitle calls “the eclipse of the common good,” the replacement of republican notions of community interest and virtue with a liberal emphasis on individual action and freedoms. He addresses the long-standing debate about the relationship between capitalism and slavery by treating the slave South as a set of “variations” on the general (presumably Northern) pattern. He suggests how conflicts over slavery (resulting ultimately in the Civil War) honed the concept of “freedom” into narrowly drawn definitions of property ownership and wage earning that cohered with the liberal ideology of a market-based political economy.

Larson balances a long chapter on the “marvelous improvements” (46) of the antebellum period with another outlining the stories of the many groups—farmers, artisans, factory-operatives, women, Native Americans, African Americans (free and enslaved)—whom these changes challenged, disrupted, or exploited. Sensibly declining to enumerate a balance between its positive and negative attributes, Larson does nevertheless demonstrate the Market Revolution’s pervasiveness. Even entrepreneurs, usually in historical accounts the heroes and beneficiaries of laissez-faire liberalism, were often the losers in an economy that promoted risk-taking, left its denizens to sink or swim, and became subject to vicious business fluctuations. Widespread economic depression, first evident after the panics of 1819 and 1837, interrupted economic progress; Larson uses these episodes to punctuate his own account of the growing influence of markets in Americans’ lives. And in a postscript, he draws connections to our current economic crisis, which was unfolding as he completed his manuscript. Though some of the specific details he relates may soon appear outdated, the effort to connect present-day concerns with the transformations of the Market Revolution adds to this book’s value as an accessible and sophisticated introduction to a dramatic phase in American history.

University of Connecticut, Storrs

Christopher Clark