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Reviews


Amidst the legal and cultural imperatives for racial and sexual diversity in American workplaces and universities over the last half-century, why do white men still dominate positions of power? Two recent monographs address this question by analyzing opponents of affirmative action in the decades before and after the U.S. Supreme Court’s landmark Bakke decision (1978), respectively. In Protesting Affirmative Action: The Struggle over Equality after the Civil Rights Revolution, Dennis Deslippe examines the range of middle- and working-class Americans who sought to limit the proactive steps taken by employers and universities to boost diversity from the mid-1960s until the late 1970s. In tracing what he terms “the longer, more varied history of affirmative action” (3), Deslippe uncovers state-centered and social movement opposition that developed alongside of the civil rights laws and executive orders established in the mid-1960s, an opposition that emerged well before the Bakke decision, the emergence of the New Right, or the rising tide of neoliberalism at the end of the 1970s.

With a fine-grained lens, Deslippe analyzes why and how diverse grassroots constituencies came to see certain forms of affirmative action as running against their interests. He first presents labor liberals, mostly industrial unionists who attempted to square affirmative action with the preexisting industrial order—and who initially viewed affirmative action as buttressing their social justice objectives. Yet in the mid-1970s, economic uncertainty and massive layoffs caused affirmative action advocates within the labor movement to see such policies as attempts to weaken
unions by undercutting the seniority principle of “last hired, first fired” and other similar time-honored labor movement prerogatives. Deslippe turns next to the realm of higher education, where colorblind liberals who favored minority rights argued that race-conscious affirmative action policies would segregate and stigmatize minorities. They found their moderate position increasingly tenuous as identity politics gained traction and the economy faltered. In the middle section of the book, Deslippe shows how these liberal opponents of affirmative action tested and refined their arguments in struggles over the *DeFunis* case (1974) and the personnel policies of the Detroit Police Department.

According to Deslippe, the muddled context of overlapping and moderate approaches to affirmative action could not survive the polarized social and political climate and the transcendence of neoliberalism in the late 1970s. The New Right politicians and conservative groups that rose to prominence recast the affirmative action debate using the precise language of merit, individual rights, and protecting the rightful turf of meritorious white men against baseless attacks by undeserving women and minorities. In uncovering the murky and complex pre-history of contemporary affirmative action debates, Deslippe shows how changing social and economic circumstances shaped diverse understandings of the meaning of race, sex, opportunity, and disadvantage—ultimately elevating certain theories of state-enforced equality and extinguishing others.

Where Deslippe describes the fractious politics of affirmative action at the grassroots, Jennifer L. Pierce explores how elite white male power became re-naturalized in the 1980s and 1990s in *Racing for Innocence: Whiteness, Gender, and the Backlash against Affirmative Action*. Pierce points out that affirmative action churned up considerably vitriolic opposition among the professional white men whose status and authority at work were little affected by it. To unlock this paradox, Pierce uses a range of methodologies—from discourse analysis of media, to participant observation and interviews, to short fiction—to present “a multi-layered historical account of the backlash against affirmative action” (12). In so doing, Pierce demonstrates how opposition to affirmative action was propelled by both collective and personal understandings of race, sex, and history that were mutually reinforcing.

In the aftermath of the civil rights revolution and amidst legal and cultural mandates for workplace diversity, elite white males sought to re-legitimize their power. Pierce argues that this project took place along many fronts—in the form of stories that news outlets and film told about white men, the stories they told about themselves, and their informal interactions and assumptions. In the first two chapters of *Racing for Innocence*, Pierce examines how the media disseminated myths about the “innocent white male” (20). The first chapter reveals how journalism outlets perpetuated inaccurate narratives that downplayed the legitimate corrective effects of affirmative action and portrayed elite white men as victims of undeserving minorities’ demands. In the second chapter, Pierce explores how Hollywood films undertook a closely related project: propagating a myth of white racial progress and emphasizing the class divide between ignorant working-class whites and the elite racially progressive whites who heroically came to blacks’ rescue. In both journalism
and film in the 1980s and 1990s, Pierce explains, elite white males were presented as morally righteous and deserving of positions of power.

Pierce then shifts her focus to study white male power within a single workplace: the legal department of the pseudonymous BC corporation, a company that underwent a court-mandated affirmative action program in the early 1970s. In their interviews with Pierce, male attorneys at BC relied on the language of neoliberalism and neoconservatism to frame their career trajectories in terms of meritocracy, personal achievement, and color-blindness. In so doing, these attorneys “rac[ed] for innocence”—describing themselves as racially progressive and detached from the same systemic forces that elevated them to positions of power on the backs of blacks and women. Pierce encountered more diverse responses from the female attorneys at BC. While some realized that they had benefitted from affirmative action, others downplayed its effects in facilitating their career trajectories, and most claimed that access to high-pressure jobs alone did not create workplace equality for women. In her final and most innovative chapter, Pierce conveys a fictional interaction between two white male attorneys and an African American female attorney who is a job candidate at their firm. The short story allows Pierce to speculate about the informal interactions and private assumptions that protect white privilege at the capillary level. Considered together, the chapters in Racing for Innocence demonstrate how collective and personal narratives of white male supremacy have buttressed each other—remaking racism and sexism as interpersonal rather than collective and institutional problems (and, conveniently, always someone else’s problem).

Each book prompted this historian to wonder whether and how affirmative action could have created meaningful diversity in American workplaces and universities in the years these authors analyze. Is affirmative action inherently polarizing, or is its potential context-dependent? Was it destined to fall short of its advocates’ hopes, or did shifting circumstances in the form of a faltering economy and an increased premium on higher education squeeze out more expansive definitions of equality as status-conscious whites and men felt the ground shift under them? While Deslippe wavers between these two possibilities, Pierce pulls back the curtain to reveal just how tightly, and in how many ways, elite white men have gripped and consolidated power when faced with pressures to make room for others—and the mental and rhetorical gymnastics they have undertaken to convince themselves and others that they came by their status fairly.

Katherine Turk

University of Texas, Dallas


In his ambitious study of popular music and modernity, Edward P. Comentale looks at blues, country, folk, and rockabilly, and traces “how earlier musical forms generated new attitudes and stances that allowed people to engage and cope with the experiences of being or becoming modern” (6). Sweet Air challenges both a romantic embrace of authenticity of these musical styles (such as Greil Marcus’ notion of an
“old, weird America”) as well as the critique of the culture industry by the Frankfurt School and stretches the concept of modernity to include poor rural communities. Individual chapters of the book depict some much-discussed performers, but Comentale manages to present them in a different light through his reading of music as “affective” and through his focus on modern technologies like the radio and the phonograph. By connecting them to literature, music, and art of the avant-garde, Comentale exposes modernist aesthetics in the works of Charley Patton, the Carter Family, Woody Guthrie, Elvis Presley, and Buddy Holly.

_Sweet Air’s_ fresh perspective on old music is commendable but somewhat de-historicized. Choosing a time frame that roughly stretches from 1910 to 1960 might have been a bit too broad, and the “airiness” of the argument does not always hold up to historical data, for instance, when Bessie Smith is discussed as a representative of the Delta blues. The last chapter of the book, “a mash-up of Buddy Holly, John Cage and Jacques Derrida,” is the most daring but also the most confusing (26). Holly certainly was more than a sentimental singer but to read his lyrics as avant-garde poetry does seem like a bit of a stretch. In other chapters, Comentale’s emphasis of modernist alienation tends to completely erase the spirituality that plays an important part particularly in blues and country music. Finally, the book suffers by focusing on almost exclusively male performers and by ignoring any transnational dimensions of modernity.

All this is not to say that _Sweet Air_ is without merit. Studies of popular music genres of the first half of the twentieth century oftentimes are indeed marred by an uncritical belief in a supposedly premodern authenticity of poor Southerners, and Comentale’s book can help to understand the fallacy of such thinking. In addition, accounts of modernity tend to focus on urban elites and exclude rural communities, and _Sweet Air_ corrects this misconception. Connecting the provocative push of the text’s dense arguments with a more specific historic analysis and more varied representations of gender and national identity could lead to a significant reshaping of popular music scholarship.

Ulrich Adelt

_University of Wyoming_
Harris to collages by Romare Bearden, and bring Furry Lewis’ guitar stylings into conversation with the vocals of Rachelle Farell.

Preston Lauderbach’s *The Chitlin' Circuit and the Road to Rock 'N' Roll* (2011) contributes to this tradition in the study of Black music. In the course of his detailed narrative history, Lauderbach maps the music business in Black America and discusses developments in blues-rooted music throughout the twentieth century. Identifying the deep imprint that the blues have made upon the United States and American culture, *The Chitlin' Circuit* surveys blues responses to conditions in African American life. Investigating a set of distinct social and geographic spaces during specific historical moments, Lauderbach’s study delivers an extended examination of African American life during the Great Migration–era. *The Chitlin' Circuit* charts the blues’ movements into an urban, industrial North as well as its adaptations to changing circumstances in the South. The volume, thereby, connects the form and function of Black music to social conditions experienced by African Americans throughout the United States.

Pursuing these ends, *The Chitlin' Circuit* engages the groundbreaking work that poet and critic Amiri Baraka performs in *Blues People* (1963). However, Lauderbach’s study forges this connection while making claims for a broader discussion of “American music” and working through notions of Black music and the color line that differ greatly from those espoused by Baraka in *Blues People*. For example, writing about the big-band era in the chapter “Swing, from Verb to Noun,” Baraka asserts that as “widespread development of the swing style [during the 1930s and 1940s] . . . pass[ed] into the mainstream of American culture, in fact, [it] could be seen as an integral part of that culture.” He goes on to suggest that this “Americanizing” process was responsible loss of “authentic tone” among swing bands and a movement away from what he understands as “Afro-American musical tradition.” In *Chitlin’ Circuit*, Lauderbach extends this point in his discussion of rock-n-roll and in post-War Black America, pointing out that “[as] creative and economic energies shifted from the nightclub to the recording studio. . . . black Main Street’s importance to American culture was erased from sight” (267).

Thoroughly researched, and professionally written, Lauderbach’s incorporates journalistic elements while combining methods and approaches that he draws from areas such as ethnomusicology and cultural studies. *The Chitlin’ Circuit* stands out as a highly accessible hybrid work, capable of appealing to a variety of readers, including students examining American popular culture and/or Black music. As it transports readers to what Lauderbach refers to as “nondescript places,” *The Chitlin’ Circuit* accesses sites and spaces where blues and Black America connect. From Indiana Avenue in Indianapolis to the Rhythm Club in Natchez, Mississippi, and on through a string of Elks Clubs and VFW Halls that run from Macon, Georgia, to Cincinnati, Ohio, the study highlights the nuanced relationships between African American cultural production and the economic realities of African American life in the United States. *The Chitlin’ Circuit* effectively chronicles conditions and circumstances experienced by African American musicians and performers working in Jim Crow America.
Lauderbach’s skillful use of personal interviews and archival sources, including a wealth of materials gathered from the Black press, illustrates the dynamic and intimate engagement between blues-rooted music and a cultural landscape that stood (and in many ways remains) invisible to most Americans. He is at his best in those sections of the volume that treat Black music in Memphis, Tennessee. The Bluff City serves as a focal point and site of return for The Chitlin’ Circuit and its investigation of the relationships connecting Black music’s makers and audiences. In particular, Lauderbach provides valuable insight regarding the ways in which Memphis-based, Black radio stations—including WDIA—worked to shape these relationships. The Chitlin’ Circuit thereby illuminates pathways by which blues-rooted music entered mainstream American culture, underscoring the vitality and significance of Black entertainment both within and beyond African American communities.

Michael A. Antonucci
Keene State College


The volume illuminates, through the analysis of travelogues, novels, and other literary sources, the textual genealogies of two symbolic figures, Tragic Mulatta and Tragic Muse. The Tragic Mulatta is a mixed race woman; the Tragic Muse is “a beautiful Jewess.” They both constitute, to use St. Hall’s concept, a “spectacle of the Otherness”—they do not fully belong to established racial categories and incite public imagination by their difference, rootlessness, and exoticism.

The author illuminates the development of racist imageries through the colonial era. “Due to lack of white females in colonies,” she says, “mixed race women became both object of sexual desire and threat to white supremacy.” Mixed race women were demonized for using their sexual charms to corrupt white men and the white race (as seducing white men and preventing them from marrying women of their own race). Since miscegenation destabilized racial categories to an extent, where women of color challenged the symbolic order by being physically white, the racial identities were sustained by social regulations (dress code etc.) and became a “matter of local tradition” only. The white female slaves, displayed and sold at the slave auctions, threatened the very idea of “whiteness” and “white supremacy,” and the image of the white female slave took a particular role in abolitionist movement.

The author argues the “beautiful Jewess” (i.e., famous actresses, socialites from well established Jewish families, as well as literary figures, portraying women of Jewish origin) symbolized “exotic beauty” in continental Europe, as mixed race women did in colonies. “Beautiful Jewess,” despite greater personal autonomy, was a subject of difference, associated with mysteries, eroticism and exoticism; she did not belong fully to any of the established categories and moves between racial and social identities, constituting a threat to the symbolic order and stability of social categories.

The volume illuminates the gradual destabilization of racial categories and human attempts to sustain the facts of “whiteness” and “non-whiteness” through social
practices of (self) representations. It brings into debate the double moral and sexual landscapes, where skin pigment was supposed to predetermine the moral and sexual make-up of the person and her position in these double landscapes.

The author introduces the concept of “white hegemonic womanhood”—the white women, despite their otherization as “second sex,” preserve at least some elements of “masculine” virtues as self-control and rationality; the non-white women were deprived of these virtuous residue and embodied pure sexuality beyond civilizational restraints. Some analysis of white and non-white masculinities would be beneficial, in order to grasp full complexity of race and gender relations.

The author reveals love liaisons as a site of struggle and illuminates empowering effects of sexuality and sexual charms as a way through which non-white (non-European) female subjects gained at least some autonomy and secured some access to wealth and power for themselves and for their origin families. This aspect is particularly valuable and deserves a more detailed examination in the context of subaltern studies, where ruse, mimicry, and pretension are seen as a typical strategy of relatively powerless social groups.

_Transatlantic Spectacles of Race_ is a valuable contribution to race and gender studies. It narrates the spectacular dynamics of power at intersections of race and gender, and illuminates the “racial taxonomies attempting to control uncontrollable shades of color” (27).

Rasa Balockaitė  
Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania


_Entertaining Elephants_ narrates the history of circus elephants in the US, from the importation of the first two Asian elephants in the late 1700s to the births of the first US-born elephant babies in the 1880s and their subsequent deaths in the early 1900s. Integrating cultural history, business history, and contemporary animal science, Nance shows how elephants and their human captors co-created the nineteenth-century circus as both a speculative, profit-driven venture and an arena for the constitution of American consumer identity. She argues that the circus elephant helped citizens develop personal and patriotic identities by spending on entertainment, while introducing Americans to a mode of capitalism linked to expanding human supremacy over other animals. This is a fascinating but gruesome history, replete with injuries and deaths suffered by both elephants and humans as they struggled, with unequal degrees of power, to sustain the circus industry amidst the growing complexity of American capitalism.

Key to this story is Nance’s distinction between individual agency, which elephants possessed, and human social and political power, which they lacked; “this was the crucial fact that made their captivity possible” and enabled circuses to become enormously popular forms of entertainment (9–10). Nance shows that elephants, though “domesticated” by the circuses, were often unable or unwilling to submit to the conditions of confinement, deprivation, and human domination that
defined their existence. Elephants exercised agency when they submitted to human
commands, which they did most of the time, but also when they refused to perform
tricks, broke out of their shackles, and occasionally attacked or killed their owners
and trainers. Such elephantine agency was always superseded by human power as
the elephants’ captors, compelled to keep the shows running on an increasingly rigid
schedule, responded with “re-breaking” methods intended to convince the offending
elephants—as well as the larger American public—of the necessity and righteousness
of human domination over non-human animals.

Thus, Nance convincingly demonstrates that the study of animals is important
not only for its own sake, but also to more fully illuminate the complexity of human
cultures. Less well evidenced is Nance’s argument that the genial circus elephant
helped American citizens writ large to define personal identity and mark the boundary
between humans and non-humans. Though she clearly shows how circus personnel
engaged in these processes, she offers relatively little evidence about how the circuses’
primarily working-class audiences responded to what they saw. This is not so much a
shortcoming as a necessary outcome of her methodology, which prioritizes circuses’
business and management decisions in response to elephants’ behavior; it also suggests
the importance of reading this book alongside other studies of human-animal rela-
tions and consumer culture in the nineteenth century, to which this book adds much.

Theoretically sophisticated, exhaustively researched, and elegantly composed,
Entertaining Elephants will appeal to a broad range of readers, who will find them-
selves thinking in new ways about not only circuses, but also the myriad other human-
animal relationships in American consumer culture, past and present, from rodeos,
zoos, and aquariums to meat, pets, Disney characters and other fictional animals.
Laura Barraclough

Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press. 2012.

Now in its third pressing (in 1981, 1992, and 2012), Ellen Willis’ essay collec-
tion Beginning to See the Light remains both relevant and insightful. The late Willis,
a prominent cultural critic, journalist, and feminist activist, offers a wide variety of
pieces on topics ranging from Janis Joplin, Woodstock, and the Sex Pistols to Easy
Rider (1969), Alice’s Restaurant (1967), and Deep Throat (1972), to the nuances of
anti-semitism, American white supremacy, and US foreign policy.

One of Willis’ clear talents is an ability to articulate complex concepts with a
precision that makes them seem simple, if not obvious. For example, in her essay on
the Velvet Underground, Willis describes the emergence of punk rock as a decade
long struggle by rock and roll “to reclaim its identity as a music of cultural opposi-
tion, not only distinct from but antagonistic to its own cultural conglomerate” (115).
In her critical review of Deep Throat, Willis complicates popular understandings of
free love, reminding the reader, “The revolt against Victorian morality has always
had its left and right wings” (68). Willis returns to this concept in an essay on her
reluctance to join a feminist crusade against pornography, and today’s reader will see
in the debate hints of the imminent rise of the American right. Applying her analytical lens to yet another topic close to her heart, Willis presents the position of Israelis as a “classic Jewish bind,” in which they represent white oppressors to Palestinians but merely Jews to the West (244).

Willis’ writing is not only sharp but also incredibly personal. Discussing her brief romance with a married man, Willis relates a conflict between her belief in free love and the feeling that she was betraying solidarity with another woman, who was also engaged in the struggle against patriarchy. Though firmly entrenched in the counterculture and the women’s movement, Willis does not hesitate to direct her critiques toward rock and roll, the movement, or herself. Rather than perpetuate hippie myths about Woodstock, for example, Willis instead underscores the incompetence of the promoters, who secured only 800 latrines for the more than 200,000 expected attendees. She also questions movement rhetoric about “the people,” given popular support for police repression during the 1968 Democratic National Convention, and she ultimately concedes that despite her hopes, the cultural left of the 1960s was effectively apolitical.

Now four decades old, much of the collection serves a primarily historical role. To that end, Willis’ prescient essays on feminist backlash are especially fascinating. On the whole, however, this work provides a sterling example of honest, critical scholarship that seeks to expose the limitations of American rebel culture but refuses to dismiss its potential to contribute to social change. Willis’ writing is witty and thought-provoking, and many of her articles would serve as useful readings in courses on American politics, popular culture, or feminism in the 1960s and 1970s.

Dawson Barrett
University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee


In commemoration of Florida’s quincentennial (1513–2013), Elsbeth Gordon has produced Heart and Soul of Florida, a captivating tour of the sunshine state’s Architectural landscape from the pre-colonial period to the post–WWII era. The work, which features one hundred and seventy carefully chosen illustrations (including sixty that are in color), is divided into three sections: Indian Florida, from 6000 BCE to the early colonial period; colonial period, from 1565 to 1821; and American Florida, from 1821 to 1950. Herschel Shepard provides a foreword in which architectural symbolism is briefly explained while he informs the reader that though many of the events and beliefs of the past are in certain cases irrevocable, their legacies nonetheless endure in the archaeological sites, landscapes, or structures that continue to exist. Such heritage, whether connected with formal religion or not, is sacred.

For a state that was largely undeveloped until the Gilded Age—when oil executive Henry Flagler built resort hotels in St. Augustine and Palm Beach and linked them to the Northeast with an East Coast railway so that the well-to-do could be transported back and forth—Florida has a surprising amount of historic architecture to take note of. Gordon emphasizes that the 1821–1950 period is when “the outstand-
ing religious and public buildings that make up a substantial period of today’s built landscape” came into existence (135). Flagler’s palatial Ponce de Leon Hotel (now the main building of Flagler College in St. Augustine) is given its due, just as Flagler is given credit for reviving Florida’s Spanish architectural heritage. However, much older are the Indian burial mounds with remnants dating to 6000 BCE. Florida is also the home of the nation’s longest lived Spanish mission (Nuestra Señora de la Leche of St. Augustine) as well as the largest coastal brick fort in the Western Hemisphere (Fort Jefferson on Garden Key, south of Key West). An artifact of the Cold War era is the Miami Daily News Building, commonly referred to as Freedom Tower because it was a beacon to those who escaped Cuba by boat.

This volume is a labor of love and a work of art. But it is much too informative to be classified as a coffee table book. Each chapter has endnotes and there is a separate detailed bibliography. The prose is almost poetic in places. For instance, one sentence reads, “Along the darkly beautiful, north-flowing St. Johns River, small board-and-batten Carpenter Gothic churches illustrate the story of the many post–Civil War Episcopal river missions” (168). Two appendices explain the rudiments of landmark designation, the National Register of Historic Places, the Historic American Buildings Survey, and Florida’s master site file and conservation and recreation lands program. Although the narrative notes what sites have been designated, a list would have been useful. There should have also been a list of all the sites discussed in the book as well as a map of the state. Minor criticism aside, Heart and Soul of Florida serves as a model for what anyone would want in a survey of architectural history for a state.

Roger Chapman
Palm Beach Atlantic University


The story begins in 1930, with the Berlin premiere of All Quiet on the Western Front, one of the most powerful antiwar films ever made. The evening itself was uneventful, except for the numbing silence at the end. The next showing caused a riot, with cries of “Judenfilm” because it was released by Universal, whose founder, Carl Laemmle, was a German Jew, as was his son, Carl, Jr., who was then production head. The incident marked the beginning of the torturous relationship between Germany, soon to be known as “Nazi Germany,” and Hollywood, brilliantly recounted by Thomas Doherty in his tension-wracked narrative of an industry struggling to do business with a country whose growing anti-Semitism, which even extended to Jewish personnel in the studios’ branch offices in Berlin, portended the eventual collapse of the German market. After Hitler became chancellor of Germany and Josef Goebbels, Minister of Popular Enlightenment and Propaganda, the bureaucracy tripled: permits, certificates, and the censor’s imprimatur. The studios complied; they were used to observing (or circumventing) the Production Code and knew that, under a state board of censors system, material acceptable in one state could be deleted in another. What Hitler in Hollywood emphasizes is that movies have always been a business in which concessions and trade-offs are standard practice both domestically
with the Hays Office, local censors, and pressure groups like the Legion of Decency, and internationally with countries like Germany with ingrained prejudices that precluded the exhibition of certain films, particularly those deemed racially impure. Hollywood for the most part ignored events in Europe and Asia that were moving the world inexorably toward war. The prelude to World War II, the Spanish Civil War, became the generic “Spanish conflict” in Last Train from Madrid (1937) and Blockade (1938). Audiences trained in hermeneutics might have figured out that the former was vaguely pro-Nationalist, and the latter, less vaguely pro-Loyalist, although sides were not specified. The newsreel, especially the March of Time, filled in the ellipses. New Yorkers who wanted the latest in world events, had newsreel theaters like the Embassy and Trans-Lux. Initially, the sight of Hitler elicited both boos and applause, and soon, just a chorus of jeers. Nazi sympathizers learned to be more prudent.

As the decade ended, so did Hollywood’s reticence. Confessions of a Nazi Spy (1939) made it clear to Americans still oblivious to the Nazi menace that there were organizations like the German-American Bund operating in New York. The following year, The Mortal Storm, Escape, and Chaplin’s The Great Dictator (all 1940) dramatized the creeping miasma of Nazism, with Chaplin brilliantly satirizing Hitler’s megalomania in a scene in which der führer envisioned himself as, literally, holding the world in his hands.

Hitler in Hollywood has the dynamic thrust of a drama, with the action moving steadily toward a climax, which sadly is 1939. It is also vividly written, academically unpretentious, and indispensable for historians and students of film.

Bernard F. Dick


The problem is the title. Within the context of Nazi Germany, “collaboration” evokes images of Vichy France and Quisling’s Norway. To say that the studios “collaborated” with Nazi Germany is to ignore the fact that studios were always making concessions to satisfy the Production Code Administration, the Legion of Decency, and the state censor boards. The studios conceded; they did not collaborate. They were also bound by the Production Code mandate that “the history, institutions, prominent people and citizen of other nations shall be treated fairly,” which included Germany, until it became our enemy, after which it was open season on Nazis. If The Collaboration has irked some film scholars, it is because of its judgmental tone. Naturally, the studios wanted to keep the German market. But that Universal made cuts in All Quiet on the Western Front for it to be shown in Germany is not a revelation. When the Legion of Decency slapped a “C” (Condemned) rating on Columbia’s This Thing Called Love (1941), the studio made the changes the Legion demanded, knowing that a “C” rating would doom the film in most parts of the country. Still, it was banned in Australia, Ireland, and British Columbia. Even today, companies seeking a PG-13 rating for a film will have to alter it if it has been classified “R.”
Urwand is a well-trained historian who knows his way around archives and special collections. What is missing is a sympathy for the position of studio heads in the 1930s. Most of them were Jews who had to do business with an anti-Semitic regime and endure homegrown anti-Semitism: e.g., Father Charles Coughlin’s anti-Semitic radio diatribes, and isolationist Senator Gerald Nye’s concern that films critical of Nazism were being produced by men with “non-Nordic names.” There were “restricted” country clubs, hotels, and even communities where Jews were unwelcome. Also, the films of the 1930s reflected the political confusion of the age. Was capitalism failing? Were fascism or communism alternatives? Gabriel over the White House (1933) and The President Vanishes (1934) could be interpreted as arguments for or against fascism. No one knew the answer, much less Hollywood.

Although Urwand correctly states that Universal’s Carl Laemmle was born in Germany (32), thirty pages later Laemmle is listed among the eastern European studio founders. There are other films about the persecution of the Jews that Urwand does not include: Beasts of Berlin (aka Goose Step, Hell’s Devils, 1939), So Ends Our Night (1941), The Cross of Lorraine (1944), Address Unknown (1944).

The Collaboration is a work of impressive scholarship, filled with sobering facts. One wishes the author were more sympathetic to the studios’ dilemma in the 1930s: If they made a movie about the plight of the Jews, would it backfire on them? Yet despite the compromises, Hollywood alerted audiences to the Nazi nightmare before the American entry into World War II, through films such as Beasts of Berlin, Confessions of a Nazi Spy (1939), The Mortal Storm (1940), Escape (1940), The Man I Married (1940), and The Great Dictator (1940), which perhaps was as courageous as Hollywood could be at such an ominous time.

Bernard F. Dick
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck


Fevered Measures: Public Health and Race at the Texas-Mexico Border, 1848–1942 by John Mckiernan-González contributes to critical conversations on the intersections of nation, race, and disease that Nayan Shah’s Contagious Divides (2001), Natalia Molina’s Fit to Be Citizens? (2006), Priscilla Wald’s Contagious (2008), and others have helped shape. Fevered Measures distinguishes itself by reporting on an elusive archive of public health mandates and responses to them that perforated the geo-political Texas–Mexico border, a history that testifies to the contradictions of borderland modernity.

Reporting on the flux of public health at the border during the nineteenth century, chapter one casts a wide net over an array of public health mandates that evolved into a U.S.–based discourse that linked Mexicans with material degradation, suggesting they were unsuitable for modern citizenship. Different from chapter one, chapter two and three possess narrative anchors that reflect the way public health directives and discourses began to take more coherent shape. Chapter two addresses an inconsistency in late-nineteenth century public health debates by juxtaposing a journalist who touted...
Nuevo León as a model of public health and a health officer who pronounced a lag in sanitation and vaccination by Mexicans that, as he claimed, proved their inferiority. Shifting focus from Mexicans to African Americans, chapter three considers the recruitment of African Americans laborers from Alabama to a plantation in Mexico and their eventual removal to quarantine in Texas for smallpox in 1895. According to McKiernan-González, this case indicates that American illness enabled the extension of U.S. authority beyond its political borders but that racial segregation superseded claims to medical and civil rights. Such extended interest in African American illness appears in this chapter alone, as chapters four and five interrogate an overemphasis on Mexican hostility toward medical modernity that failed to capture the ways they resisted and submitted to public health measures. Specifically, chapter four focuses on newspaper representations of smallpox and yellow fever in Laredo from 1898 to 1903, and chapter five attends to the treatment of typhus and resistance against those efforts in El Paso and Ciudad Juárez from 1910 to 1920.

While differentiated from other chapters by its analysis of embodied vaccination verification, chapter six repeats a discrepancy, established throughout the book, between Mexican adherence to medical modernity and public health officials who ignored it. Indeed, chapter six makes a cogent case for a dynamic wherein Mexicans challenged abusive public health measures, the U.S. federal government responded, and the Anglo population resisted cooperation with federal rulings. Chapter seven advances the book’s timeline to 1920–1942, returning to previous topics such as typhus by addressing racist surveillance of Mexico’s 1932 Olympic team that public health concerns enabled.

The clear achievement of Fevered Measures is McKiernan-González’s excavation of an under-examined archive about public health at the Texas–Mexico border. At times, however, devotion to archival detail comes at the cost of presenting cases of disease and themes that tend to tread the same ground rather than complicate the book’s argument about the contradictions of borderland public health.

Misun Dokko Shippensburg University


From Harriet Beecher Stowe’s Uncle Tom’s Cabin (1852) through Nathanael West’s Miss Lonelyhearts (1933), Aaron Ritzenberg’s The Sentimental Touch examines how the action and meaning of touch in literature changed from the mid-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century. During this period, “the utopianism of the sentimental touch [was] transformed from a vision of overcoming social barriers to a promise of intimacy in an anonymous world” (3). With the growth of managerial culture, the presumption that touch could connect oneself with others to inspire social change was undermined by the proliferation of disperse corporate hierarchies, and by the rise of literary realism. But importantly, Ritzenberg notes that with their rise, sentimentalism did not vanish. Rather, it was “used, reused, and disfigured during the rise of managerialism” (3). While critiqued—and perhaps manipulated—by authors
such as Mark Twain and Sherwood Anderson, the sentimental touch persisted: even in the literature of realism, “as its appearance becomes rarer, its correspondence with a specific utopian ideal becomes more pronounced” (6). In this way, the sentimental touch continues to capture an idealism that seems loftier, yet more subject to manipulation, today.

Ritzenberg’s introduction sets up the primary tension between sentimentalism and managerialism. “If the sentimental body was transparent, legible, and intimate, the managerial body is opaque, mysterious, and unlocatable” (7). This does not mean, however, that these bodies are entirely separate from each other. As Ritzenberg notes in his first chapter, on *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, sentiment is an emotion managed by its authors: in Stowe’s case, sentiment is carefully deployed to train readers to understand the book’s political message. “Sentimental works show us the feelings of characters to manipulate our own feelings. . . . Sentimentalism, then, always has a certain political charge insofar as it is engaged in manipulating the real bodies, the actual lives, of its readers” (16–17). By showing readers the potential for radical politics through characters that are touched by slavery’s very resistance to touch, Stowe shows readers how to “properly” understand the world in which they live. It may “feel” spontaneous, but as Ritzenberg demonstrates, sentiment, like most “feelings,” are not exclusively self-determined.

In his second and third chapters, Ritzenberg explores how sentimentalism is critiqued by Mark Twain and Sherwood Anderson. The promise of touch to connect people is particularly questioned by Twain in the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1885), through Huck’s—and Twain’s—constant “stretching” of stories to suit their purposes. “For the sentimentalist, truth lies in the realm of the body. . . . By questioning the very possibility of truth, Twain questions the political potential of sentimentalism” (46). For Twain, touch is no longer sincere in its origins, a reflection on a rising culture that sees sentiment as a way towards productivity and profit. In Ritzenberg’s reading of *Tom Sawyer*, he sees both “cheap sentimentalism” leading to “abusive managerialism” (68). For Anderson, in *Winesburg, Ohio* (1919), touch is not only insincere, but a sign of dysfunction. Touch neither creates nor signifies solidarity, but anxiety; touch intrudes upon alienated characters who do not understand why they are being touched. As Ritzenberg writes, “In such a world, the sentimental touch should not work. An act where two characters share a single truth through their bodies seems doubly impossible. . . . The sentimental bodies in Anderson’s work are utterly lost in the modernist age” (81). Yet the presence of touch, no matter how awry, indicates that realism and modernism “hold on” to the sentimental in some way: even in showing how unsentimental the managed world has become, both Twain and Anderson manipulate sentimental tropes, including touch, to show the difference between the sentimental and the modern.

In the tension between the sentimental and the managerial, the managerial ultimately wins out, as Ritzenberg articulates in his reading of West’s *Miss Lonelyhearts*. Managers come to deploy sentiment as a way to humanize their corporate practices; elsewhere, workers find sentiment to be a release from the strictures of their corporatized lives. In other words, sentiment becomes part of management,
which, in turn, shows the mechanics behind the sentimental touch. The success of touch to “train” us works both ways: “the trope is powerful because it is reproducible and exchangeable. . . . If the sentimental touch redeems humans from a mechanical world, it also exposes us to the mechanical quality of the very thing that makes us feel most human—our emotion” (95). The sentiment of touch is as cog-like as the managers who manipulate it. The advice columnist “Miss Lonelyhearts,” after all, is not a person but a pseudonym for those employed by the corporation that owns the advice column. Corporations profit from the inability to touch that they themselves create, through the very promise of touch that they claim to offer.

Ritzenberg’s study succinctly captures a major tension in the study of sentiment and sentimental literature: the very conventionality of the sentimental touch allows for connection as much as it does for exploitation. His writing style is clear and intelligent. His insistence on examining both the dystopian components of sentimentalism alongside its more utopian promises leads to a balanced and engaging text. His assertion that “The sentimental touch shows us not just the ethical value of bodies and feeling, but also the ethical value of literary convention” is well worth consideration (127).

Douglas Dowland
Ohio Northern University


Bachelors and Bunnies offers an intriguing interpretation of Hugh Hefner’s Playboy in its first two decades, portraying the magazine as a champion of sexual liberation for women as well as men, and, even more surprisingly, as a proponent of heterosexual monogamy. Carrie Pitzulo has arrived at these counterintuitive, revisionist views after scrupulous investigation of Playboy’s company archive in Chicago; thorough reading of the magazine’s understudied Forum and Advisor columns; and interviews with Hefner and other magazine editors. The quality of this evidence, along with Pitzulo’s deft shaping of it, ensures that this book will set the terms for the next generation of Playboy scholarship.

Pitzulo concedes that in its early years Playboy (founded in 1953) reveled in the anti-female male chauvinism endemic to postwar American culture, fanning men’s fears of suffocating mothers, nagging wives, and venal gold-digging co-eds. And she faults Hefner for taking an overly self-righteous, defensive posture when he became the target of feminist outrage in the early 1970s. (“A woman reading Playboy feels a little like a Jew reading a Nazi manual,” Gloria Steinem allegedly said.) But the upshot of Pitzulo’s argument is that Playboy was in the vanguard of 1960s-style liberal feminism—by celebrating female sexual agency in its pictorials, as well as through its editorial and financial support (via Hefner’s Playboy Foundation) of political campaigns for women’s abortion rights, educational and professional opportunity, and equal pay for equal work.

That Playboy nevertheless “fell short of a truly feminist agenda,” as Pitzulo soberly concludes, should surprise no one familiar with the image of a silk-robed Hugh Hefner surrounded by a harem of nubile blondes (166). Whatever else it might
be, *Playboy* is first and foremost a vehicle of male pleasure and fantasy. In its early years, Hefner’s magazine battled a much-publicized masculinity crisis brought on by the decline of rugged individualism, the soullessness of corporate office work, and the valorization of domestic family life. Hefner proposed that men, in effect, embrace their feminization. The playboy is a man who loves cooking, shopping for clothes, and decorating his bachelor pad. He scrutinizes himself, and other men, with “a self-consciousness usually reserved for women” (6).

And Pitzulo isn’t convinced the visual objectification of Playmates was nearly as nefarious as *Playboy*’s feminist critics alleged. Much as she finds the wholesome girl-next-door Playmate formula limiting as a representation of American femininity, Pitzulo credits the centerfold feature with normalizing not just female availability but also women’s right to enjoy sex, thus subverting the Victorian sexual double-standard. In any case, the *Playboy* that emerges in *Bachelors and Bunnies* is less a soft-core porn slick than a national forum for thoughtful discourse about modern heterosexual relationships (though one intriguing discovery from Pitzulo’s scrutiny of readers’ letters is of gay men using *Playboy* to speak to each other). Perhaps Pitzulo’s most seductive finding is that *Playboy* was committed above all to monogamous heterosexual love and marriage—but only after an early adult period of stylish hedonism in the well-appointed urban penthouse.

John Gennari

University of Vermont


This collection of Norwegian immigrants’ letters home comes from the Norwegian National Archives (*Riksarkivet*), but here they are translated into English. Remarkably, these *Amerikabrev*, or letters from the United States, were recognized early and preserved as important cultural commodities recording the lives of the new immigrants in a strange country.

The letters, chronologically arranged from 1838–1870, are translated into eminently readable, natural English with notations where necessary. (This reviewer, unfortunately, cannot compare the translations with their originals.) Each letter is labeled by a logical numbering system, and the editors have taken pains to give the writers and recipients both accurate names and locations.

Letters revolved around money, health and sickness, jobs and land, the connections between the far flung immigrant communities (mostly New York, the Midwest, and Texas), and varying attitudes as to whether life in the United States was better than that in the home country. Unexpectedly interesting points arise; for example, multiple voices say that women’s clothes from the home country would make it difficult to get jobs in the new (50–51). Instead, Norwegians are urged to bring their best clothes, but also homespun and spinning supplies to make garments that would blend in better.
There are many remarks about industrialization in the United States: immigrants comment on Americans’ store-bought clothes, the railroad, and farm machinery. One correspondent remarked “many things are done much better and faster than in Norway” (264). Whether the immigrants made the right choice to move is also a topic of conversation, with opinions from “But I’ve never wished to be back in Norway” (388), to a cautionary “For my part, I’ll certainly not advise anyone to come here” (404).

While the book is an obvious source for information about the Norwegian immigrant experience itself, especially what it felt like to be far away from friends, family, and known social arrangements, it might prove useful to a variety of other researchers, although there is no included topic index (the index is in volume four).

If one reads all the letters, there is information for those doing research on farming practices, financial arrangements, wages for women and men, disease outbreaks, attitudes towards American slavery, the impact of the Civil War, the gold rush, and food availability and preferences (oatmeal bread and lingonberries were severely missed). A surprising number of words are devoted to prices, both of land and goods, but also of the significant expense of postage. The editor notes the cultural practice of sharing and circulation of letters in Norway, especially before 1870, so there are fewer intimate details, as writers in the new land knew that their letters might be read by family, neighbors, and acquaintances eager to gain information about life in the U.S.

Emily Godbey
Iowa State University


The University and the People examines the influence of Populism on higher education at the turn of the 20th century. Author Scott Gelber looks at the ways in which “academic Populists”—Populist leaders and editors as well as administrators, trustees, faculty, and students with ties to the movement—pressured public universities to redress issues of cost, access, and curriculum. Committed to the belief that higher education should be a public good open and of use to all Americans, not just elites, academic Populists played an important role in the expansion of vocational education, extension schools, and tuition assistance programs like work study and cooperative ventures.

This well-organized, deeply researched book shows how academic Populists in Kansas, North Carolina, and Nebraska in particular worked to redefine the meaning and purpose of U.S. higher education in the late nineteenth century. Gelber converges primarily on the South and the West because Populist grassroots activity and state university enrollments were both greater in these regions than in the North. Each chapter focuses on “contextualizing and analyzing the ideology of . . . academic Populists,” describing their efforts to change admission policies, tuition structures, and curricular content at various public universities (13). While the book carefully explicates sundry policy debates that transpired on the local level, it also provides the reader with a broader cultural perspective. Gelber peppers The University and the
People with references to novels by Willa Cather and Edward Bellamy, nonfiction by Thorstein Veblen and John Dewey, and the real life school experiences of literary figures like Theodore Dreiser and Hamlin Garland. In addition, Gelber discusses the shortcomings in Populist ideology when it came to advocating for women and African Americans. If academic Populists addressed the education of women at all, they tended to suggest “young women take vocational courses in order to increase their productivity, preserve their moral fiber, and prepare themselves for the possibility of widowhood” (113). Similarly, despite their professed egalitarian ideals, Populists either ignored or endorsed racial discrimination. As Gerber reminds us, this was a movement that “emphasized the educational disadvantages facing the sons (and sometimes the daughters) of white farmers” (67).

One of the more interesting findings of the book is the fact that many of these sons wanted little to do with the vocational curriculum for which their elders had lobbied so hard. Once they arrived at college, the ambitious rural poor discovered that they did not want to take agricultural courses and return to the farm; they wanted to go into commerce, engineering, or a professional field so that they could achieve middle class status. The number of graduates of land grant colleges who became farmers in the 1890s hovered around two percent. “Few students attended college in order to perform manual labor or maintain a sympathetic connection with agricultural or industrial workers,” writes Gelber (118). Thus, under pressure from academic Populists, a number of state universities altered their curriculum and created new academic departments, only to find these programs under-enrolled as the sons rejected the vision of the fathers.

Adam Golub
California State University, Fullerton


“The ambassadorial tradition in African American writing has remained uninterrogated in relation to one of the New Negro era’s major arenas of political culture. This political culture operated on the planetary scale of official internationalism, and it became co-constitutive with the cultural politics of New Negro artistic ambassadorship” (14). American studies, and African American and black diasporan literature and culture scholar Brian Roberts probes U.S. international diplomacy of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to illuminate the “strong and weak, formal and informal, connections between official internationalism and African American culture” (10). His work “offers critical access to previously unrecognized black internationalists tradition produced as African American and U.S. imperial cultures have met and shaped one another” (8). Roberts arranges dialogues among the fields of anti-imperialist critique, African American literary studies, and studies in black transnationalism to demonstrate how the literary and diplomatic performances of African American writers functioned rhetorically to, at some moments, undercut
U.S. diplomatic intentions yet, at other moments, operated as a means of promoting the imperial sway of the United States.

Arranged in three parts, *Artistic Ambassadors* outlines the interlocking dimensions of race, aesthetic, and international representation, and “outlines the ways in which black work in diplomacy played previously unsuspected roles in shaping major African American representational concerns, including the capacity of New Negro race men to speak for the nation’s black masses, the methods of race representation under dispute in the Booker T. Washington/W. E. B. Du Bois debate, and the signifying status of women and the black diaspora within domestic and international African American cultures” (6). Roberts examines the aesthetic and political representations of famous figures such as Frederick Douglass, James Weldon Johnson, Richard Wright, and others and brings them into dialogue with the work of lesser-known black official and unofficial writer-diplomats of the New Negro era.

Part one articulated the struggles faced by luminaries such as Frederick Douglass and lesser known African American diplomats in creating a narrative for the New Negro to supplant the myth of the Old Negro—ranging from Jim Crow to Zip Coon, Rastus to Sambo, Uncle Tom to Aunt Jemima—created by white Americans. Part two described a politics of immanence in which race becomes incidental to New Negro internationalism. Insider status becomes paramount though performances of immanence were inevitably imperfect and incomplete. Part three examined the “integration of hip knowingness of black vernacular culture into official diplomacy’s traditionally staid approach to internationalism” (118). It would have been informative if this work examined how the antecedent rhetoric of the Old Negro contained in U.S. cultural exports, predating and contemporary with the deployment of African American diplomats, weighed on the effectiveness of the representatives.

Robert’s debut book is a challenging and enlightening interrogation of the international and literary projects of New Negro era figures. In addition to African American and American Studies scholars, this text is of interest to political science and international studies scholars, and literary critics.

Z. Hall Independent Scholar, Kansas City, Missouri


Recent scholarship on African American history has moved from a focus on geographic communities and the struggle for abolition, to newer studies like *All Men Free and Brethren*, which describe tensions within the various African Americans communities and emphasize the importance of black institutions in the struggle for racial equality. One important theme of this essay collection is the Masons’ demand for racial equality and their desire for recognition of universal brotherhood by white Masons.

The co-editors and contributors to this collection have all previously worked on African Masonry, but this book benefits from the focused nature of the essays. When
other scholars discuss Masonry they usually gloss over it in the rush to recount the creation of separate churches by free African Americans. While those churches have long been understood as important and worthy institutions, only recently has Masonry been studied as one of the few national non-denominational groups and an important source of insight into class tensions within the African American communities. Most, if not all, of the essays grapple with this question by acknowledging that Masons saw themselves as elite but believed that they also spoke for their community.

Where many of the essays fall short is in placing the African Masons within that larger community. They have an almost exclusively biographical approach by focusing on leading Masons and their texts. This biographical approach is not necessarily a failing. Many scholars, noting the paucity of records for the vast majority of African Americans, have turned to a personal focus in order to illuminate larger movements and themes. Still, in a movement long labeled as exclusive and elitist, not even addressing the focus on individual leaders is problematic. One of the essays to successfully confront that task is Julie Winch’s examination of the leading Philadelphia Masons, the other members of that lodge, and their place in the surrounding community.

It is also to their credit that the essays examine African Masonry from a variety of angles and timelines. Beginning with the founding by Prince Hall in Boston in 1775, an event recounted several times in the book, Masonry is examined in North and South up to the 1920s. There are also examinations of its influence on rhetoric, religion, and gender. The book successfully serves two masters by showcasing new directions in the scholarship while also including a detailed chronology, definition of Masonic terms, and extensive endnotes. The appendices reprint important primary documents and list the available archives for Masonic sources. Despite this extensive supplemental material, a few illustrations or images would not have gone amiss.

Essay collections are inherently difficult. This one manages to provide both a useful primer on African Masonry while also showcasing excellent recent scholarship. No one can argue any longer that Masonry was unimportant to the movements for abolition and equality or complain that sources on African Masonry are hard to find. That the book also highlights new scholarly directions in religion, gender, and racial identity only adds to its merits.

Matthew Hetrick Loyola University


Over the last two decades, early American scholars have made repeated attempts to shift the focus of religious studies away from the actions of individual ministers and onto the marginalized groups they sought to catechize, including displaced Native Americans and enslaved Africans. In Native Apostles, Andrews extends the work of predecessors such as Joanna Brooks (American Lazarus; Oxford, 2003) and Kristina Bross (Dry Bones and Indian Sermons; Cornell, 2004) both temporally and geographically; Bross treats the evangelization of these racialized groups in the seventeenth
century and Brooks the eighteenth, but Andrews surveys both while simultaneously expanding their focus on New England and Pennsylvania southward, down the North American seaboard into the Caribbean, and westward, across the Atlantic Ocean to the West African coast. The sheer breadth of materials, the surprising number of indigenous and Christian spiritual traditions that he reviews might have doomed a lesser scholar, yet Andrews ranges effortlessly across the Atlantic and an array of religious denominations to foreground a tradition of sacred leadership that native Africans and Amerindians forged for themselves.

Scholarly narratives of interracial evangelism in Puritan New England typically begin with the labors of John Eliot, but Andrews notes that “the first Christian missionary to Indians in Massachusetts was not John Eliot, but rather a Massachusetts native who traveled to a minister’s house in Salem, heard stories from the Bible, and then ‘went out amongst the Indians, and called upon them to put away all their wives save one, because it was a sinne’” (25). Because Eliot only traveled from his Roxbury pulpit to the Praying Indians at Natick once every two weeks, Andrews suggests that the native evangelists he ordained “were usually on their own” (53); as Andrews demonstrates repeatedly, in a wide variety of geographic and denominational contexts, “native preachers often outnumbered the white ones working beside them” and exercised more control over the work of evangelization than the European figures whose labors have been disproportionately well preserved in written records (7). A prevalent belief that Amerindian or African preachers could persuade their countrymen to Christianize more effectively than white ministers led Anglican, Moravian, and Congregational clergymen to rely on the oratorical skills of racialized preachers.

This logic—as well as a belief that Amerindian or African bodies would better withstand the rigors of itineracy and creole climates—was the justification for sending Philip Quaque to preside over spiritual affairs at Cape Coast Castle, appointing black teachers in the Charleston Negro School of South Carolina, and sending Native American ministers such as David Fowler to the Iroquoian nations. Andrews provides a number of excellent case studies, but his most important contribution to scholarship might be an appendix that identifies 275 African or Amerindian preachers; his list helps to demonstrate that appointing native religious leaders was a pervasive trend rather than an occasional practice. With Native Apostles, Andrews has reconstructed the lives and motives of these preachers. His book is an essential companion to Linford Fisher’s The Indian Great Awakening (Oxford, 2012), a study whose breadth will ensure its place on the bookshelf of any serious student of religion in the early modern Atlantic world.

Zach Hutchins
Colorado State University


Bob Gluck’s You’ll Know When You Get There: Herbie Hancock and the Mwandishi Band is a welcome addition to the slowly growing bodies of scholarly literature on both post-1967 electric jazz and on iconic bands and recording projects. In addition,
Gluck takes a step towards filling a mighty gap in jazz scholarship—biographical and analytic research on Herbie Hancock. For researchers, Hancock and his several closest collaborators have been difficult interview subjects, so this book, which blends hard-gotten author interviews with previous published material is extremely valuable to anyone interested in Hancock and his music in general, as well as the Mwandishi Band, which was a pioneer in electric/electronic jazz and musically adventurous.

The book touches on several topics of interest to current scholars: the collaborative production of music by musicians, producers, and engineers, the business aspects of jazz band-leading in the 1970s, and the role of effective marketing of music by record labels. Gluck makes good use of his access to Hancock’s bandmates who appear pleased to talk about Mwandishi, a rewarding musical collaboration which they uniformly characterize as spiritual. The book is somewhat less convincing when engaging those spiritual aspects, at least in distinguishing an extra spiritual dimension of this band from spiritual musical connections made all the time on bandstands. Another problem is that Gluck provides little help in distinguishing Mwandishi’s spiritualism from the Pan African–derived spirituality that was so widely cited at the time. The book concludes with refreshingly lengthy remembrances by the band and other musicians whom they inspired. While these testimonials are valuable, that they are from impressionable up-and-coming musicians results in a concluding “amen” rather than contributing any insight as to why the band today remains marginalized and underappreciated in jazz history.

Nonetheless, You’ll Know When You Get There, makes valuable contributions to writing about jazz in this era, beyond its documentation of this vitally important band. For example in “New Musical Directions,” Gluck contributes a brief but useful history of the electric piano in jazz, the timbral and touch differences among the leading keyboards of the day, and the approaches players took in using the instruments. Innovation in instrumentation has been scarce enough in jazz that seldom do writers think it worthy of discussion. In “Mwandishi: The Recording” Gluck makes note of connections between experimental musical practices in concert music and jazz that are sadly often overlooked, as well as the radical pairing of jazz and rock production practices in Hancock’s music. That chapter and the next, “Crossings,” devoted to the music, recording, promotion, and reception of the same-named 1972 LP, are perhaps the high point of the book. Mwandishi and Crossings confused and befuddled Warner Brothers’ executives who “did not know how to sell the new recording,” nor did they know how to market it on radio and Gluck effectively conveys the band’s innovative disruptions of musical and business practices (101). Overall, You’ll Know When You Get There is an essential study of Hancock and the music of a band that represented a road not taken.

Aaron J. Johnson  
Columbia University

With her book *The New Mind of the South*, Tracy Thompson contributes yet another perspective to the long tradition of thinking and writing about the constitution of “the South” in American society. This perspective consists of a narratives of herself and her family “whose roots go at least six generations deep in the soil of Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee” (2), of her impressions when traveling through the South, and of extensive research of the sociocultural history of this region. With this mixture, she attempts at formulating Southern identity in the twenty-first century and at discussing the current “mind” of the South.

This “mind” as she claims, is actually a double-consciousness. In a rather superficial manner she refers to W. E. B. Du Bois’s “famous remark” about the consciousness of African Americans in the early twentieth century and attests Southerners, thus also herself, a “two-ness” that is supposedly not comparable to other regional identities in the United States (2). To be Southern and American means to have an “extra layer of identity,” which is in constant struggle for self-definition (2). In eight chapters she elaborates on the complex network, a “box” as she claims, that is Southern identity today (8). In this box she stores religion, slavery, conservatism, adaptability, a lack of historical awareness, and race. Although most of her arguments are based on her personal observations and on her knowledge of the South, she creates a suitable historical context for each of her approaches to Southern identity, which is due to the detailed research she conducted.

Yet Thompson occasionally reproduces an exceptionalist discourse of the South that seems outdated. Although she repeatedly states that certain observations, like the disappearance of “[r]ural America” is also a “phenomenon . . . very much in evidence in the Midwest” (141), its effects are “magnified” (143) in the South, because this region holds a special place in American history, having existed “from the earliest days” of the American nation, “when the definition of ‘American’ was still struggling for consensus” (8). She thereby implicitly states that the South is more American than other regions and thus “special” (10, 14) in every way. This was also W. J. Cash’s argument in *The Mind of the South* (1941), the book her title alludes to. It is debatable to what extent such an exceptionalist argument is helpful today.

What is certainly helpful is Thompson’s conclusion that the “two-ness” of being Southern and American is not only a burden, but rather a symptom of the South that will never, and should never be overcome. It is a symptom that allows for the plural society that is the South today. She exemplifies this plurality appropriately and deviates from Cash’s understanding that the South is a homogeneous region. In a positivist and idealist manner she finally defines Southern identity as a biracial (not post-racial), multietnic, communal, and overall contested identity that fluctuates between nation and region, history and imagination.

Evangelia Kindinger
Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany.

The impulse to transnationalize the study of Asian American literature has grown apace in the past two decades, at the same time that a similar pattern evolved in China studies, under such rubrics as diasporic, Sinophone, and global Chinese literature and culture. Few, however, have brought to this project the comparative systematicness, dual geographical depth, and sustained thematic focus that characterizes Wen Jin’s *Pluralist Universalism*. Well researched and richly contextualized, Jin’s book examines the ethno-racial policies of the United States and the People’s Republic of China through the lens of their respective fictions on multiculturalism. Reading English alongside Chinese literary texts while working with cultural and scholarly sources across both languages, Jin adroitly mines for parallels between the two nations’ seemingly oppositional multicultural visions—American liberal multiculturalism on the one hand, China’s policy of ethnic autonomy on the other. In the process, Jin brings into rare critical dialogue the U.S.’s and the PRC’s divergent treatments of minority groups, persuasively arguing that their two multiculturalisms be understood as part of a “global movement,” “two different but not entirely incongruous forms of pluralism that have increasingly come to bear on each other” (1).

As Jin observes, comparisons of the two countries’ ethno-racial policies often descend into a “solipsistic, accusatory mode” (xii), so that targeting the other regime’s minority governance has become constitutive to nationalistic rhetoric on both sides, giving rise to a recurrent and ever more prominent geopolitical discourse in our time. Given this polarized situation, Jin sees contemporary fiction as a fertile site for drawing out connections between the two official multiculturalisms and hence opening up a framework for “double critique.” Chapter 1 provides an informative survey of the historical origins and political underpinnings of American versus Chinese multiculturalism, one developing in the wake of racial desegregation and the other from socialist revolution. Yet both states, Jin asserts, “practice a conciliatory form of multiculturalism” that has at its core the “imperative of national unity” (43). Chapter 2 then identifies two popular novels, Clive Cussler’s *Treasure of Khan* (2006) and Jiang Rong’s *Lang Tuteng/Wolf Totem* (2004), that symptomize their countries’ conciliatory multiculturalism, each “projecting an image of ethno-racial harmony” while failing to tackle structural inequalities (73).

From there, Jin turns to works by minority authors—with particular emphasis on Chinese American fiction—that explicitly challenge conciliatory multiculturalism and that propose more inclusive models of pluralism. Chapter 3 focuses on Alex Kuo’s *Panda Diaries* (2006) as exemplifying a double critique of the U.S.’s and the PRC’s internal colonization of indigenous groups. Chapter 4 further probes the failures of both states’ multicultural policies toward their Muslim communities from the perspectives of two Muslim writers, Zhang Chengzhi and Rabih Alameddine. Finally, Chapter 5 mediates between the Chinese original and English translation of Yan Geling’s *Fusang/Lost Daughter of Happiness* (2001) as well as its critical reception in both languages, rereading the novel as not just a narrative of historical
racial and gendered oppression but an utopian “queer” text that “helps imagine and broker a radical kind of pluralist universalism” (200).

Compelling in its claims for the need to think between national discourses, to read minority writings comparatively and thereby transform our existing frameworks, *Pluralist Universalism* charts a valuable course for future transnational studies of both Asian American and Chinese literature.

Belinda Kong
Bowdoin College


Three points of clarification: (1) By the authors’ own reporting, Jason Shelton (University of Texas–Arlington) was the principal author of *Blacks and Whites in Christian America*, (2) By “Christians” the authors really mean Protestants; and (3) Quite often, when speaking of white Protestants, they focus on evangelicals. The authors limited their study to Protestants because of their historical dominance in American religion and because of the high proportion of African Americans among Protestant denominations. Perhaps a fourth point would be that the authors make little effort to differentiate between various Protestant denominations except to focus on evangelicals, whose attitudes and beliefs are more fully developed and easier to study than non-evangelicals.

The authors examine the racial differences in how black and white Protestants think about and practice their religious faith. As found in previous literature on the subject (e.g., C. Eric Lincoln and Lawrence and Mamiya), the authors find significant differences, which they explain by focusing on African Americans and the “building blocks” of Protestant faith: black Protestant faith is active and experiential; black Protestant faith is critical to survival and coping with everyday trials and tribulations; black Protestant faith is mystical and includes folklore and cultural components derived from the African Diaspora; black Protestant faith is confident and comprehensive; and black Protestant faith is committed to social justice and equality.

As in earlier studies, the authors argue that the cumulative effects of past and present racial discrimination and inequality have influenced African American religious beliefs. Where the authors’ study diverges is that whereas most previous studies have been done by historians and theologians, these authors are sociologists. Their sources consist of two major national surveys—the 2006 Portraits of American Life Study, mostly, and secondarily, the General Social Survey of the same year, plus focus groups and personal interviews. This, they argue, allows them “to move beyond theory and conjecture” (3). (Appendices A and B provide important information on sampling procedures, sample characteristics, as well as valuable tables.)

The authors show that as a result of their history and present situation, African Americans remain committed to a unique form of Protestantism, on which they rely to protect them against the consequences of racial discrimination and inequality;” as well as believing that it has been that faith that has allowed them to survive, even make
it, in the United States—“but for the grace of God” (26). The related, and perennial, issue of individualism versus structuralism in addressed in chapters four and eight.

This reviewer would have liked to have seen the use of data drawn from more than one year, which might, perhaps, have pointed to some differences over time—if only in degree. But otherwise, the research is solid and grounded in accepted sociological theory. Moreover, *Blacks and Whites in Christian America* is accessible to non-social scientists, which makes it an important read for those involved in interdisciplinary studies (4).

Bryan F. Le Beau

*University of Saint Mary*

---


Since Barack Obama’s 2008 presidential victory, media pundits, social commentators and academics have eagerly weighed in on the significance of our first black president. Obama’s political victories, rhetorical strategies, racial identity, and often shifting stances on important contemporary issues have been the subject of numerous books and essays. *The Iconic Obama, 2007–2009: Essays on Media Representations of the Candidate and New President* contributes to this growing body of what we might call Obama studies. The president’s complex personal history and sophisticated media representations, both those he has sought to manage and those he has been subject to, demand rigorous forms of interdisciplinary analysis.

The editors of this collection have gathered essays from a broad range of specialists which elucidate how, as they explain, “Barack Obama’s campaign and transition into the American presidency created a space in which activists, politicians, fans, and artists converged, using Obama’s image to represent their respective ideologies” (1). Contributors explore the various ways in which Obama’s image has been utilized for a wide range of political ends, affirming one of the most important aspects of our president’s media legacy: his remarkable malleability. This point is emphasized in the collection’s first section, which focuses on Obama as a brand and summarizes his impressive rise. While much of this account retreads familiar territory, the five other sections offer fresh insights into Obama’s image in popular culture, both in the United States and abroad. Essays on television, film, rap music, comic books, and digital social networks explore how Obama’s meteoric rise both influenced and was influenced by a wide range of media representations.

Many of these contributions offer surprising claims that challenge popular assumptions about how Obama rose to victory. For example, Justin S. Vaughn’s “Character-in Chief: Barack Obama and His Pop Culture Predecessors” analyzes how depictions of African American presidents in films and television series did not simplistically lay the groundwork for public comfort with a black Commander in Chief. In addition to a fascinating account of screen depictions of black occupants of the Oval Office, Vaughn argues that the use of a black president in science fiction films only affirms such a seemingly apocalyptic and fantastical possibility. The final
section of the collection, “International Responses: Obama’s Popularity Goes Global,” includes essays that examine Obama’s reception in Japan, Turkey, and France. These accounts demonstrate how Obama’s image operates in a globalized context that is transforming America’s reception abroad.

While many of the essays read as overly edited with their dutiful introductions, conclusions, and excessive section headings, the collection as a whole makes a welcome contribution to our understanding of what Obama means in the public and popular imaginary. Our president’s legacy is far from over and this book will provide an important point of departure for future investigations of Obama’s evolving image.

Stephanie Li
University of Rochester


Lauren Rabinovitz traces the coevolution of American cinema and amusement parks, posing provocative new questions about subjectivity and spectatorship at the turn of the twentieth century. She begins by framing these forms of entertainment as national phenomena that cannot be reduced to a single case study: “By 1910 every municipality with a population of more than twenty thousand had both amusement parks and motion picture theaters” (8). By examining the emergence of these venues across the country, Rabinovitz troubles the conventional narrative that the early amusement park was inherently democratizing. While Coney Island famously “allowed for commingling of immigrants,” most parks were racially segregated. Some “catered exclusively to African Americans in both the North and the South,” while others functioned as metaphorically and socially “white cities” (27–8). Rabinovitz explores how these sites were literally linked by interurban rails and ideologically linked by a shared vision of mechanized modernity. Even if amusement parks were not microcosms of the “melting pot,” they still promulgated other national values, training Americans to enjoy the electrified urban landscape—including its attendant dangers (64).

The final chapters of this study lend even more depth to the rich, archival history with which it begins. In her discussion of pyrodramas, disaster shows, and other thrill rides, Rabinovitz lingers on the bodily motion and the streams of sound that accompanied visual spectacles. By attending to the multisensory experiences of fair goers, she crafts a convincing argument that amusement parks and motion pictures taught Americans to relish the anticipation of danger. Ironically, these venues did more than simulate danger for public enjoyment—they were also vulnerable to the same disasters they put on display, such as fires, floods, and cyclones. In light of these actual and virtual dangers, the popularity of these rides and shows indicates a fascinating nexus of fear and pleasure. At this intersection, Rabinovitz discovers fantasies about subjectivity and “new lessons about tourism and nation building” (98). She closes Electric Dreamland by reflecting on how these fears were sublimated into enduring amusements of the late twentieth century: the slapstick comedy and the nostalgic, family-oriented theme park. Overall, this rigorous volume contends that American
cinema and amusement parks can best be understood together. If its argument about Americans coping with modernity and technology is not entirely novel, its approach and subject matter raise new questions about the psychological experience of the technological sublime that should appeal to a wide range of humanists and historians.

Jennifer Leigh Lieberman
University of North Florida


John Lynch has written a history of the Catholic Church in Latin America that is both sympathetic and critical. While it relies mostly on secondary sources, the author’s deep familiarity with the topic allows him to offer judicious assessments of complex and contentious issues and also to include telling or just fascinating anecdotes.

Several themes recur throughout the narrative. Defining what it means to be “Catholic” has always been a matter of negotiation and debate between the hierarchy, itself divided along various lines, and the laity who express their religiosity in ways appropriate to their local communities and ethnic identities. Another theme is the struggle between those clergy who sought to place the Church on the side of oppressed groups and the hierarchies in America and Rome that were more concerned to protect ecclesiastical prerogatives by aligning the Church with the regnant political establishment, be it the Bourbon monarchy or Populist politicians.

The book is especially excellent in its coverage of the 18th and 19th centuries. Its account of the tortured relationship between the Church and slavery includes both the hierarchy’s official reluctance to condemn the institution until it was almost moribund and the courageous efforts of obscure (to me) priests who ministered to slaves and suffered imprisonment for their efforts to end the institution. Lynch argues that the hierarchy failed to offer a reasoned response to the 18th century Enlightenment and thereby condemned their 19th century successors to a succession of losing battles against anti-clerical liberals. At the same time, the Church’s rationalistic theology also made it tone deaf in its dealings with popular religious movements.

The Latin American Church began to recover intellectually and institutionally in the late 19th century under the influence of reformist currents emanating from Rome, but that process also made it vulnerable to dictation from a papacy that claimed absolute doctrinal authority as seen in the Papal crackdown on Liberation Theology. While Lynch is clearly sympathetic to progressive clerics, his judgments are carefully nuanced. His discussion of the Cold War period includes detailed narratives from several nations in South and Central America to illustrate the range of lay and clerical responses to the ideological currents and political calamities of the age. They demonstrate how difficult it was for Catholics to navigate these treacherous political waters without foundering on the shoals of one sort of extremism or another.

Unfortunately, given the book’s subtitle, other religious traditions are discussed with far less substance and subtlety. Lynch’s account of pre-Columbian religions is perfunctory. He crowds most of his discussion of Judaism, Protestantism, and Spiri-
tualism into a single chapter, tellingly the shortest one in the book. Had the subtitle of the book been *A History of the Catholic Church in Latin America*, there would be no cause for complaint, for on that subject, the book is superb.

Daniel R. Miller

Calvin College


If any setting seems removed from the transnational metropolis of modernity, it is Main Street, USA, a fantasy locale depicted by Walt Disney, Norman Rockwell, and other nostalgic visionaries. The archetype ranges in size and temperament from Grover’s Corners, to Winesburg, Ohio, to Bedford Falls, but it is usually comprised of a town square or village green, a row of mom-and-pop storefronts, and a folksy cast of characters. For decades, jeremiads have lamented the demise of a romanticized Main Street economy as it is ostensibly crushed by an industrialized Walmart behemoth. We have all heard the polarizing Wall Street-vs-Main Street or global-vs-local rhetoric in the mainstream media.

Much work in American Studies has demonstrated the centrality of iconic small towns in civic and national culture, where Main Street often exemplifies an idealized and innocent stable community. *Main Street and Empire* similarly posits that the small town symbolizes the past, while the city symbolizes modernity. Ryan Poll’s work is unique in arguing that the small town trope is actually a complex ideological form, pivotal to the development of U.S. imperialism and intercontinental capitalism. Small town America, to Poll, is a source of national identity that is used as an abstract in dominant narratives. Main Street has long been a signifier of national values, because, even as the United States’ power grew, the country refused to recognize itself as an empire.

*Main Street and Empire* focuses on the small town’s ideological history as an island form; this aspect of American exceptionalism facilitated obliviousness to the nation’s imperialist personality. The book is grounded in Marxist literary and cultural criticism. It alleges that a “small-town episteme” in the prevailing small town canon is what blinds small-town subjects to a globalizing capitalist modernity. One strength is Poll’s willingness to look beyond U.S. borders and analyze the small town in an international context. The book’s chapters evaluate literature, political discourse, sociological studies, and physical small towns, including Sinclair Lewis’ *Main Street* (1920), Sarah Palin’s campaign speeches, Robert and Helen Lynd’s *Middletown* (1959), and Celebration, Florida. Greater attention to photography, paintings, and other visual representations of Main Street would strengthen the book; however, the author’s métier is literary analysis, and treatment of exemplary texts is certainly sufficient for the author to support his assertions.

One particularly intriguing chapter uses Philip K. Dick’s 1959 dystopian novel *Time Out of Joint* to exhibit how the governing small town is mobilized for an expanding empire. Even in the era of postmodernism, Main Street as a geographic imaginary remains relevant to U.S. identity. *Main Street and Empire* is a solid addition to the cadre of work in American Studies that grapples
with the intersections between landscapes, globalization, imperialism, "national character," literature, history, and cultural representations. The canonical small town may be a myth, but it is not, as is often asserted, an obsolete one.

Robin O’Sullivan
Troy University


Since the emergence of the “intersectionality” paradigm twenty-five years ago, scholars from across the humanities and social sciences have steadily expanded the horizons of what began as a project interrogating the co-constitutive natures of race and gender. Perhaps due to 9/11 and its aftermath, the last ten years have seen a surge of studies focusing on intersections of religion and race in U.S. history and culture. Numerous monographs and anthologies—including Craig Prentiss’s Religion and the Creation of Race and Ethnicity (2003) and Henry Goldschmidt and Elizabeth McAlister’s Race, Nation, and Religion in the Americas (2004)—have begun mapping America’s religio-racial terrain, showing how religion and race have always been central to changing definitions of citizenship and identity. Faith and Race in American Political Life, edited by Robin Dale Jacobson and Nancy D. Wadsworth, contributes to this emerging field by demonstrating how interwoven categories of religion and race have shaped twentieth- and twenty-first-century politics. Its twelve essays, mostly written by political scientists, track how religion and race have operated together in a variety of political contexts, including Supreme Court decisions, voting patterns, the demographics of party affiliation, civil rights activism, immigration debates, battles over the Confederate flag, and inter- and intra-church controversies.

For readers working in American Studies, the editors’ introduction is likely to be the most useful portion of the book. In addition to providing a brief but provocative overview of America’s religio-racial political history from the colonial period to Barack Obama, Jacobson and Wadsworth attempt to explain why religion has only recently been seen as important to intersectionality scholars. They note that religion “is not easily situated in respect to power” and that scholars have viewed religion as fundamentally different than race, class, gender, and sexuality because they have naively seen it as a “choice and not (at least not permanently) externally inscribed on the individual” (12, 14). By stressing the complexities of religion, the way it “crossects every other identity category” and can act as a “source of privilege, status, disadvantage, or resistance,” the editors make a compelling case for why religion must be moved to the center of our understanding of American racial politics (17).

The essays themselves are divided into three sections. “Foundations” contains historical case studies; “Acting Out” focuses on contemporary voting trends, party membership, and policy questions; “Possibilities and Limits” looks at how specific religious groups—the Nation of Islam, Mennonites, South Asian Hindus and Muslims, conservative evangelicals, and mainline Protestants—have confronted the nation’s post-1960s racial landscape. Two essays stand out as particularly significant for American Studies scholars. In “What Would Robert E. Lee Do?,” Gerald R.
Webster and Jonathan I. Leib demonstrate how religion has been a crucial though overlooked component of debates over public displays of the Confederate battle flag in the South. The authors demonstrate how both white and black Southerners have framed the issue in terms of not simply race and public memory but also Christian duty. In “Ambivalent Miracles,” co-editor Wadsworth explores evangelical Protestants’ recent attempts at “racial reconciliation” and multiracial church building. While most scholars have viewed such attempts as fatally flawed neoconservatism strategically avoiding any substantive systemic change, or even as self-serving “purification rituals that fantasize liberating a (white evangelical) community from its particular sins,” Wadsworth highlights how black and white evangelicals have together striven to create “organic, culture-based conversations” intended to decenter white privilege through “rituals of apology, witness, and repentance” (250, 268–69). These intriguing essays, together with the excellent introduction, make the anthology a welcome addition to an important and expanding field.

Joshua Paddison

Wittenberg University


Since its founding at Tun Tavern in 1775, the US Marine Corps has transformed itself from an unpopular military service into an elite force in US national defense and international affairs. What led to the Marine Corps’ splendid achievements? How do the Marines think and act differently than the other US military services? The answers to these critical questions are ignored by the academia to some extent. In Underdogs, Aaron B. O’Connell provides good answers to these questions from the perspective of Marine culture.

O’Connell’s arguments differ from much of the existing work on the Marines. Because he holds the position of history professor at the US Naval Academy, as well as the rank of senior Marine reserve lieutenant colonel, O’Connell attributes the Marine Corps’ growth to a unique organizational culture, and identifies the period from World War II to the Vietnam War as that of the most dynamic growth in Marine culture.

In the opinion of O’Connell, Marine culture is symbolized by “exceptionalism,” which could be deconstructed into three components. The first of these components is the Marine Corps’ successful opposition to “institutional abolition” (e.g., unification of the military services or more civilian control over the Corps). Historically, this opposition promoted the institutional expansion of the Marine Corps for decades. To gain more legitimacy, the Corps tried to cultivate sustainable partnerships with civilians (e.g. academics, statesmen, journalists, historians and filmmakers) during wartime and peacetime. The most attractive example of this that O’Connell provides is the elite group nicknamed the “Chowder Society” within the Marine Corps, which successfully stopped the Truman government from carrying out plans for budget cutbacks in the Corps. Second, the Marine Corps personalized public relations infrastructure and strengthened internal cohesion through the discourse of “American family life” (85), which prioritized the experience of privates (the youngest members in the Marine
and integrated their families and communities into the Marines’ preexisting narratives. Third, the U.S. Marine Corps favored “toughness and ability to prevail in the most violent situations” (255). As a result, the Marines suffered high casualty rates in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, and endured the most difficult operations.

As O’Connell highlights, Marine culture does have its negative attributes. For instance, the cultural indoctrination that served Marines well in the Corps could possibly lead to disastrous tragedy in civilian society (e.g., using violence to resolve disputes). On the other hand, the Marines’ internal cohesion reinforced “the Corps itself” (277), rarely being simply about concepts of country or patriotism.

Marine culture faces contemporary challenges. During the past decade, many former US Marines have become private security contractors, who work for the lucrative private security industry rather than the military. This development does not exclude the possibility that some former US Marines will fight for anti-government forces, disreputable governments, or controversial figures in the world. Does this challenge the cultural perception that Marines are loyal only to the Corps?

*Underdogs* provides invaluable contributions to the study of US Marine culture. It’s a must read, and will prove an oft-cited book for scholars, academics, and students who are interested in the study of US military culture and history. Moreover, this well-researched book is a highly recommended purchase for university libraries and other research libraries.

Kai Chen

Zhejiang University, China


Snapshots of the 1960s fill many pages of the scrapbook of the American century. These images display the heroism of the unknown masses as well as the achievements of the Great Men of the Moment. The few pictures here that capture the relationship *between* the giants on the mountaintop and the masses that fought injustice from the bottom-up depict scenes of a middle-aged white man in shirtsleeves, a thick mop of hair covering one eye, being pulled by throngs of young people of color. These are portraits of Robert F. Kennedy and the thousands of poor Puerto Ricans, Latinos, Native Americans, and African Americans who were in the thick of the era’s battle for American democracy and with whom he came to share common cause. Seeking to transcend the standard political biographies of Kennedy, Edward Schmitt’s *President of the Other America: Robert Kennedy and the Politics of Poverty* places this scene at the center of his story.

In the mode of Thomas Jackson’s treatment of Martin Luther King, Jr.’s social philosophy in *From Civil Rights to Human Rights* (2006), Schmitt’s project here is to show us the genealogy of Kennedy’s 1968 campaign as the poor peoples’ presidential candidate. Relying upon a conventional variety of archival sources and grounded firmly in the political and policy histories of the War on Poverty, the book takes us from RFK’s introduction to the “Other America” during his brother’s campaign to win West Virginia in 1960 to his own adoption of the issue as a domestic policy pri-
ority during his senatorial campaign in 1964. A naïf about the realities of life on the other side of the tracks, Kennedy at first made personal connections with civil rights leaders and human rights activists for political gain. The more he learned about the conditions of poverty on Indian reservations, among migrant workers, and in urban slums, however, the more incensed he became. Schmitt paints a portrait of a man of privilege to whom poverty had been invisible. And when the scales were removed from his eyes, he became a man who truly saw. Thus, unlike other generals in the poverty war, Kennedy’s ideology was shaped by genuine outrage.

Unlike Jackson’s book, though, Schmitt’s gives readers little substantive insight into RFK’s journey through the thicket of ideas prevailing in midcentury social policy about poverty. The literature on this topic focuses on the divide among experts between “structural” and “cultural” definitions of the problem and Schmitt works within those conceptual confines. But Kennedy’s eclectic ideas don’t neatly fit within those categories. Kennedy opposed the boldest anti-poverty proposal floating around Washington in the late 1960s, the guaranteed minimum income, and he pioneered what we now call enterprise zones and public-private partnerships in the Bedford-Stuyvesant slum of Brooklyn. He also believed that the central problem facing the poor was limited opportunities for employment and he endorsed job programs in lieu of job training, putting him well to the left of his Sargent Shriver’s Office of Economic Opportunity. Indeed, by the time of his presidential campaign, RFK had, Schmitt argues, become suspicious of government not because it was too generous to the poor but because it was too bureaucratic to provide real help for urgent problems. This being said, Schmitt’s analysis of RFK’s evolving approach to poverty does raise provocative points about Kennedy’s notion of community, one influenced by his Catholic faith and by his immigrant roots, and his very real fear that the American community was vulnerable to violent fractures rooted in economic inequality.

In the end, and perhaps somewhat unintentionally, Schmitt shows us that what made Kennedy the “President of the Other America” wasn’t a set of policy proposals or political positions. Instead, it was his insistence, rooted in a deeply felt truth, that in America, who was rich and who was poor was as much a matter of fortune as it was of personal fortitude or special genius. For a man of means to acknowledge that, but for the whim of Fate, he could have been born poor and black was to suggest that poverty was an affront to America’s founding principles. At a time in which noblesse oblige has given way to neo-Sumnerian cries of “We Built That,” Kennedy’s moment seems even more fleeting. Schmitt does us a service by reminding us that it ever happened at all.

Sheyda F. A. Jahanbani University of Kansas


In this extremely compelling narrative, historian Gary May does a masterful job of connecting the actions of blacks in the south who wished to exercise their political rights and broader local, regional, and national developments. He also makes judi-
cious use of data to demonstrate the changes in participation in the electoral system of blacks as both voters and office holders.

With the passage of the 14th and 15th Amendments during the period of Radical Reconstruction after the Civil War, “as many as two thousand (blacks) served as state legislators, city councilmen, tax assessors, justices of the peace, jurors, sheriffs and U.S. marshals; fourteen black politicians entered the House of Representatives; and two became U.S. senators” (xi). However, “by 1877 southern white Democrats had overthrown every new state government and established state constitutions that stripped black citizens of their political rights” (xi).

For approximately 80 years southern states employed a number of devices to exclude blacks from registering and voting. These well-known tactics include poll taxes, literacy and “understanding “ tests, and residency and property requirements. The significance of the ballot was best stated by Thurgood Marshall, who opined that without it “you have no citizenship, no status, no power in this country” (xiii).

May details back- and front-stage developments leading to the 1965 Voting Rights Act (VRA). Perhaps the most infamous of these was the march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama on March 7, 1965 (“Bloody Sunday”). Although Dr. King was in Atlanta, he was aware of the brutality at the march and believed that images of the event would arouse the American people. Executives at ABC television decided to run its fifteen-minute footage of the beatings at the Edmund Pettus Bridge. Americans demonstrated across the nation, thousands travelled to Selma, and numerous religious leaders came in response to Dr. King’s call for a march from Selma to Montgomery.

Throughout this period President Johnson refused to intervene to protect the voting rights of blacks. However, a tipping point was reached at which he directed his staff to work on a draft of a voting rights bill. He addressed a joint session of Congress and announced that a voting bill would be forthcoming. At the same time and in spite of criticism, Dr. King organized the march from Selma to Montgomery.

May devotes an informative chapter to the Washington politics that transformed the bill into the VRA of 1965. A bill with bipartisan support was passed by the Senate and by the House, and the version that emerged from Conference received support in both houses (House: 328–74; Senate: 79–18). On Friday, August 6, 1965, President Johnson signed the bill, and the VRA became law. A major limitation of the VRA was that it called for a reconsideration of the “trigger” and “preclearance” sections in five years. The Act survived criticism in each house of congress, and was signed, not always enthusiastically, by presidents Nixon, Ford, Reagan, and by G. W. Bush for a 25 year extension in 2006.

Recent attempts to limit voter registration and the June 25, 2013 Supreme Court Decision (Shelby County v. Holder) attacking a portion of the VRA (See John Paul Stevens, “The Court & the Right to Vote: A Dissent,” The New York Review of Books, August 15, 2013) make evident that the battle is not over and that “‘Voter Suppres-
sion’ is as American as cherry pie” (253).

Mark Oromaner Independent Scholar, New York
In this very well-written, extremely well-documented, and ambitious book Andrew Jewett argues that “the meaning of science is fluid, contingent, and contested” (372). The documentation, in terms of footnotes and citations, reflects Jewett’s education (PhD in History, University of California, Berkeley) and his “epic academic journey” (viii) to his present position (Associate Professor of History and Social Studies at Harvard University).

The documentation also aids the reader in accepting and following up, if necessary, Jewett’s observations on debates within the natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, and theology concerning the role of science within a changing American democracy. Indeed, Jewett provides passing reference to the post–World War II “emerging field of American studies” (337). This is done in the context of his description of a humanities approach, as contrasted to a science approach, among American historians. At the same time, in keeping with his position that developments within disciplines and schools of thought are always contested, he follows the cited statement above with the observation that “. . . Columbia’s Richard Hofstadter, among others, retained important ties to the social sciences” (337).

In an explanation for the growth of scientific disciplines after the 1860s, Jewett challenges theses that are based on liberal Protestant interpretations, or professional, class, or status bases. Rather, he posits that this growth reflects the attempt to mobilize science “as a resource for strengthening American democratic practices” (1). Science and the university will replace religion and the church. Although a who’s who of guiding academics and intellectuals of the twentieth century are discussed, the philosopher John Dewey is presented as the symbol of this movement. At the center of Dewey’s thought was the assumption that science contained within itself the seeds of a democratic society if only it could be extended to the realm of human behavior.

Jewett employs the label “scientific democrats” for the diverse group of American thinkers who believed that science provided a basis for a cohesive, democratic, modern society and culture. In terms of democracy, they assumed that within the American framework, public opinion is central. Their claims for science were more controversial. For this group science meant more than the use of empirical methods and technological information and growth, it also “meant behaving in accordance with specific ethical tenets or exhibiting particular ethical virtues” (10). These underlying ethics were suited to the needs of a modern society. The bulk of the text conveys the successes and failures of the “scientific democrats” through political and social periods of change from World War I to the Great Depression to the New Deal to World War II to the Cold War and the dominant value-free and ethically-neutral view of science. Jewett also briefly comments on emerging challenges to that view.

Jewett has provided a comprehensive history of competing interpretations of the meaning and uses of the term science. His work is a highly significant contribution to an understanding of a central component of American intellectual thought.
As such, it is essential reading for advanced students and scholars in a number of disciplines. Finally, during a period in which science is under attack from both the political left and the political right, his concluding words are worth repeating: “In the end, a history of science’s past political meanings can demonstrate only that its present political import remains up to us” (374).

Mark Oromaner
Independent Scholar, New York


As he expertly navigates the literary and the social landscapes of the newly founded nation, Philip Gura outlines the rise of the American novel beginning with William Hill Brown’s The Power of Sympathy (1789). His coherently organized study aims to revive “a dormant tradition” (xix) of earlier studies of the novel by Alexander Cowie (1948), Richard Chase (1957), and Henri Petter (1971). As Gura demonstrates, these texts overlook a number of important novelists without whom no study of the American novel is complete. Gura provides a more inclusive outline by including women and African American novelists who were crucial to the novel’s development and evolution. He thus responds to scholars like Nina Baym and Jane Tompkins, who have argued for the inclusion of female novelists within the tradition as crucial to the novel’s evolution.

Truth’s Ragged Edge begins when religion and a relationship to the Divine dominated American life, then moves through the shift to concerns with free will, and ends with novelists’ critiques of Emersonian self-consciousness. Each of Gura’s eight chapters focuses on a specific decade and several of its most prominent and often overlooked authors. Gura revises the literary legacy of James Fenimore Cooper, for instance, by pointing to writers such as John Neal and Catharine Maria Sedgwick, whose novels are engaged with contemporary social and economic issues. Importantly, Sedgwick emerges as the most influential of the three because her novels “established patterns that many authors, particularly women, reprised through the 1860s” (49).

Gura explores novels such as Susan Warner’s runaway bestseller The Wide, Wide World (1850), which sparked interest in fiction by women, and Caroline Chesebro’s representations of “the indignities suffered by women in heterosexual relationships” (132) as he demonstrates that even when women novelists wrote within the conservative sentimental genre, their popularity permitted other female authors to publish more experimental fiction. Moreover, Gura analyzes the work of William Wells Brown whose Clotel; or, The President’s Daughter (1853) stands out as the first novel by an African American author and Harriet Jacobs’ Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl (1861), whose autobiographical novel “offered a serious challenge to both sentimental conventions and contemporary slave narratives” (160) alongside Frank J. Webb’s The Garies and Their Friends (1857) and Harriet E. Wilson’s Our Nig (1859), both of which focus on racism and prejudice in the North rather than slavery in the South. The last part of Gura’s study comments on the literary developments of the 1860s and 1870s by discussing influential cultural journals such as Harper’s
and The Atlantic Monthly, which aided the publication of novels by women authors who “were responsible for the final important development in the early American novel” (219). Gura thus details female novelists’ place at the forefront of social and economic critiques of American individualism.

Truth’s Ragged Edge is an excellent interdisciplinary read as Gura weaves together literary and social landscapes, illustrating how the rise and development of the American novel responded to and represented the new nation’s religious and political landscapes alongside its most pressing economic and social issues.

Justine M. Pas
Lindenwood University


Magazines in eighteenth-century America were what twentieth-century media executives would have called “loss leaders.” This insight was by no means lost on printers in the colonial era and early republic. Yet for the better part of a century, the brightest and most business savvy among them continuously poured their resources, talents, and passions into magazines. This begs the question, why?

In The Rise and Fall of Early American Magazine Culture, literary historian Jared Gardner tackles this question. The answer, he convincingly argues, is that in magazines, writers and printers hoped to create a new literary form especially fit for the give-and-take of an open, republican society. The model for this distinctly Enlightened literature was the coffee house–birthed magazine of early Georgian London—especially Tatler, The Spectator, and The Gentleman’s Magazine. And the key figure in this literary scene was the editor, or the man or woman of letters qualified to orchestrate the boisterous debates of the day into a civil and coherent, even if still conflicting, body of discourse. Thoughtful printers and writers prized the magazine form, Gardner argues, because it offered a middle ground between the partisan, and often, radical tinge of the newspaper and the authoritarian tendencies of the novel. By the second decade of the nineteenth century, however, such efforts were fading fast in the face of an encroaching market revolution.

Obscuring the early magazine’s rightful place in the history of print culture, Gardner asserts, has been an almost universally held assumption among scholars that the birth of the American novel was tantamount to the birth of an American literary culture. Yet as Gardner shows, the very authors most commonly cited as having invented the American novel—William Hill Brown and Hannah Webster Foster—abandoned that form in favor of anonymous magazine writing. Early chapters analyze their work for signs of an editorial mindset. The heart of the book, though, is Gardner’s study of the uniquely collaborative writing, editing, and reading work through which magazines were constituted, and which enamored figures from Benjamin Franklin to Susanna Rowson. In closing, Gardner tracks the demise of early magazine culture through the lens of a young Washington Irving. Although well done, an expanded body of analysis here could have better illuminated the processes of marketization through which print culture was remade.
Throughout, Gardner situates magazines within the reprint culture of the time, connecting the collaborative activities that characterized it with Habermasian insights on the links between civil discourse and democratic rule. In doing so, Gardner suggests that the open, anonymous nature of the early magazine can tell us much about the political possibilities and perils of contemporary digital culture.

In sum, Gardner’s compact but ambitious work aims to significantly revise our understanding of both early American media and American literature. Succeeding, *The Rise and Fall of Early American Magazine Culture* should be required reading for historians of the early republic and American print culture. New media scholars and contemporary journalism critics have much to gain from reading Gardner’s impressive work as well.

Richard K. Popp

University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee.


Naturalization and denaturalization, the legal pivot of debates over who gets to be an American, thread throughout our history. We are once again in a moment when naturalization (and thus denaturalization, Esau to its Jacob) is a contentious and charged issue. These debates over citizenship have been perhaps especially visible in the United States because that nation came into existence when the nation-state comes to be the dominant, even hegemonic, political formation, a formation that raises the question whether nationality is a natural (i.e., ethnic, racial) category or a cultural one (i.e., ideological). At various times this question has been answered differently in the US, a problematic visible from the first immigration law (1790) that restricted the path to citizenship to white Europeans.

Patrick Weil’s *The Sovereign Citizen* offers a necessarily partial answer to this question, focusing as it does on the legal, administrative, and judicial history of one key component of citizenship: the rules governing when a naturalized citizen can be deprived of his or her citizenship. Although rules governing naturalization were established at the very beginning of the republic, denaturalization did not become a formal legal category until the Naturalization Act of 1906. That allowed for loss of citizenship for several reasons—expatriation and political views prominent among them. Even then, denaturalization was seldom simple and not always a priority. The willingness of the government departments (at various times, Justice, Labor, and/or Commerce) charged with enforcing the law varied considerably. Perhaps the greatest if perhaps unintended result of the new law was to accelerate the shift in granting citizenship from the states to the federal government.

Weil notes such aspects but focuses elsewhere, offering a well-researched legal history that traces changes in the legal basis of citizenship in the United States from the concept, ascribed here to Hannah Arendt, that being a citizen means having the “right to have rights” to making citizenship the basis itself of sovereignty. He uses a “micro-historical approach” (6) to show how the Supreme Court altered its decisions and reasoning about denaturalization and denationalization. Thus, being a citizen
of the United States came to mean the citizen was himself or herself the source of sovereignty; hence the government, a creature of the sovereignty of each and every citizen, could only denaturalize and/or denationalize citizens who had themselves clearly renounced any claim to American citizenship and/or committed fraud. How this transformation came about over the course of a little more than 60 years is a fascinating if somewhat disjointed tale, an instructive one especially for readers interested in the workings of the Supreme Court between the 1930s and the 1970s.

This is a valuable book, but I would offer two caveats. The subtitle is misleading since the book has no interest in the “origins” of the republic. As well, Weil’s history is perhaps more a Whig history than it would seem to others who might choose different dates to tell this story. Regardless, one has to admire the research, intelligence and value of The Sovereign Citizen.

Ross Pudaloff
Wayne State University


For over three decades scholars have been attempting to unpack the complex layers of cultural meaning embedded in American home design. Now Diane Harris offers us Little White Houses, which examines how race influenced the design and representation of the postwar American house.

Harris’ study extends from the end of World War II to the beginning of 1960s, a period of relative fluidity in definitions of whiteness. Even as Jews and other ethnic groups began to attain homeownership—that key element of the American dream—FHA policies denied black families the same opportunity. For Harris, this overt exclusion of nonwhites from the postwar suburbs is only part of the story; the rest involves how “broadly dispersed social practices that were adopted in mass media, by the building trades, and by the design community” (42) worked to define the ordinary house as a middle-class, white space.

Drawing on a variety of disciplines, Harris surveys home magazines, architectural drawings, consumer goods, and television to uncover an unspoken “iconography of whiteness.” Code words like “clean,” “quiet,” “leisure,” and “privacy” served to mark whiteness in rhetoric surrounding the homes, while the spatial contours of the homes themselves—an inward focus, hyper-maintained interior, and open floor plan replete with built-ins—created an environment particularly crafted for middle-class, white families.

Harris shows that home magazines routinely used models and controlled accessories in photo shoots, rendering nonwhites invisible and creating a specific iconography not just of race, but of class, gender, and heteronormativity (she describes a photo shoot where editors posed a female model in a hostess coat with the real gay homeowner). The argument is strongest when Harris demonstrates the practical ways that home design reinforced these representations. Postwar homes effaced nonwhite servility from kitchens, making the wife the “white collar executive” of the home, providing her with a kitchen desk and electrical appliances that removed the stigma
from performance of housework. In yards, black lawn jockeys and lawnmowers branded “Lazy Boy” replaced actual people of color, while at the same time emphasizing the racialized, menial nature of yard work.

At times, Harris’ argument relies on a circular logic: because property owning was a white privilege, everything linked to property owning was therefore white. The focus on race also leads Harris to shortchange some of her more intriguing observations relating house design to postwar anti-communism, the rise in consumerism, and the overarching importance of order in the home and yard—the roots of this obsession deserve a more complex explanation.

Overall, *Little White Houses* is both lots of fun and incredibly valuable. Harris enhances our understanding of postwar culture by highlighting the invisible nature of structural racism and the work that our built environment does in perpetuating it. White Americans have long viewed themselves as entirely unracialized and their spaces as race-neutral, at the same time benefitting from a segregated housing market and all its implications. Harris convincingly demonstrates that white privilege is not just cultural and economic, but spatial as well.

Elizabeth Hoffman Ransford Independent Scholar, Grand Rapids, Michigan


Robert Prouter’s new book offers scholars a much-needed organizational history of high school athletics in the United States during the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Prouter’s basic narrative is cut into three distinct eras. The first era, which encompasses the years 1880 to 1900, addresses the impromptu, student-run athletic programs that first emerged in the elite private schools of the Northeast. Prouter contends that although administrators at these schools approved these types of activities, officiating, facilities, and sponsorship were often provided by adult authorities outside the schools—most notably universities and private athletic clubs.

Prouter then discusses the rise of athletic programs in public high schools between 1900 and 1920, paying special attention to how educators began to assume greater control over interscholastic sports due to fears of rowdynam, allegations of fraud, and a general belief that too great an emphasis on athletics was devaluing the overall educational experience. This was the era in which high school athletics were re-organized at the school level, the league level, and the state level. Universities and private athletics clubs still played a significant role in interscholastic sports during this period, but their influence was slowly being eroded as World War I neared.

The final section of the book examines the emergence of high school athletics as a truly national phenomenon between 1920 and 1930. Prouter claims that the control and governance of interscholastic sports during the years leading up to the Great Depression were taken over by the National Federation of State High School Athletics Association, which effectively ended sponsorship from universities and private athletic clubs.
Prouter does an excellent job explaining how the organization of high school athletics was transformed between 1880 and 1930, while also discussing the extent to which class, race, and gender greatly affected this process. Nonetheless, Prouter’s work is problematic in at least two respects. For starters, his analysis dwells much too heavily on the Northeast and the Midwest, with particular emphasis on New York, Boston, and Chicago. This wouldn’t have been too much of a problem had Prouter positioned his research as a regional or sectional study rather than a national study, but without providing more analysis of athletic programs in, say, the Deep South or the Southwest, Prouter, in effect, leaves himself open to criticism.

Similarly, Prouter’s perspective is muddied by the fact that students, the very people who were subjected to greater institutional control during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, do not have much of a voice in his work. Educators, media representatives, and business leaders are given their due, but one would be hard-pressed to understand how students responded to many of the sweeping changes that were enacted.

Despite these concerns, Prouter’s book represents an excellent contribution to the study of high school athletics, offering intriguing arguments that will be of interest to a wide academic audience.

Jason Reid
Ryerson University, Canada


Among the most prominent topics in American Studies are those with resonance for early Americanists: the ramifications of colonialism, the legacy of slavery and indenture, and the status of gender in historical meditations on public virtue. Karen Weyler addresses these and other enigmatic themes from the perspective of early modern outsider authors: the poets, printers, editors, artisans, and aspirants whose means of actualizing their public personae were never necessarily a simple matter of setting pen to paper. Phillis Wheatley, now celebrated as an early American poet of great skill and insight, made sense of authorship as an accession to knowledge of literary genres and their manipulation. She lived what Weyler calls a dualistic existence as acculturated to whiteness and Christianity and yet wholly unlike her audiences in New England. While her reliance on elegiac writing ensured her place in period discourses that drew significantly on faith, evangelism, and other topoi, her elegies also maintained her status as a complicated authorial and racial figure in an equally complex public sphere (57). As Weyler points out, Wheatley is a fascinating figure not least for the ways in which she rendered gender fungible, standing for the potentiality of Africans and African Americans male or female (68). Deborah Sampson, who masqueraded as an enlisted male soldier in the Revolution, challenged early Republican paradigms of authorship on separate terms, seizing control of her celebrity status by refashioning notions of masculine and feminine virtue (145). In instances in which male intermediaries and authorial collaborators spoke for Sampson...
herself, her own understanding of the performative nature of gender as well as of the power of oration was nevertheless publically recognized.

The several outsider men whose lives as literate cultural agents limned some of the same complexities are on display here amid close, critical readings of period sources both iconographic and textual. Weyler considers the captivity narratives of Briton Hammon and John Marrant as intricate interrogations of the nature of orality: of what it meant to ferry their personal testimonies into print and subsequently into the cosmopolitan, international market of the London press (78). Weyler succeeds perhaps most compellingly in narrating the literary legacy of the ordained minister and Mohegan Indian Samuel Occom, a man in his own words plagued by the burden of suffering anything he had written to appear in print, potentially exposing his ignorance to the world (114). That sense of doubt was offset by the considerable skill with which Occom negotiated two cultural poles: the New England Christian theocracy and his own vision of what Weyler calls a radically hospitable Christianity that embraced individuals of all races and social classes. Attentive to questions of print media, ephemerality, genre, collaborative authorship, and sponsorship, Weyler herself negotiates the literate dynamics of these early Republican outsiders with considerable sensitivity. Those readers familiar with her Intricate Relations: Sexual and Economic Desire in American Fiction, 1789–1814 (2005) will recognize the same deft attention to archival sources and empathetic readings of secondary scholarship here. Gina Rivera


From moonlit magnolias to quaint rural folk, the template for tourist images of the South has been narrowly construed, as shown by Rebecca Cawood McIntyre in Souvenirs of the Old South: Northern Tourism and Southern Mythology. What is the genealogy of these images? To answer this question, McIntyre delves into the history of southern tourism starting in the 1830s, when northern guidebook writers took advantage of better transportation to travel through the South and write about it for other northerners. In this way, McIntyre is interested in what might be called the touristic colonization of the South by the North. As she writes, “travel literature instructed tourists to see the region as a place where tourists could temporarily alleviate the problems and uncertainties of the modern world by stepping into a Dixie fantasyland of the past” (7).

Using sources including guidebooks and travelogues, McIntyre explores how the imagining of the South changed over time. Before the Civil War, tourist discourse ignored slavery in order to assert that the South was America writ small, except with amenities like hot springs (arguably better than the crowded ones in upstate New York) and picturesque landscapes. In the postbellum era, however, travel writers emphasized the South as different from the frenetic north. It was romantic, simpler, and, most disturbingly, peopled by rural whites and African Americans whose stereotypical depiction was meant to soothe anxious northerners whose own cities were
becoming more ethnically and racially diverse. While ascribing attitudes to people in the past is always fraught, McIntyre argues that, “by detecting which experiences are packaged with a particular image, it is possible to uncover the needs, desires, and anxieties of the tourist audience” (4). When focused on specific details, she meets this claim. For example, she shows how images exaggerated rustic decrepitude in order to sell a gothicized South by comparing an engraving of a moss-covered riverbank from *Picturesque America* (1872) with a photograph of the same place that shows it to be less alien. People are also subject to such framing. When taking a photograph of “Old Sam” for *The Illustrated American* (1890), journalist Julian Ralph noted that Sam suggested that he open his shirt to the waist, clearly to fit the expected image of a poor but happy African American. The political ramifications are underlined when Ralph writes, “the most touching and kindly, and even romantic, memories in our history are associated with the old relations of master and slave” (127).

As this suggests, tourist images can have negative real-world effects. McIntyre could have spent more time on representations of blacks and poor whites, contextualizing this work with other scholarship such as Doris Witt’s *Black Hunger: Soul Food and America* (2004) and Anthony Stanonis’s *Creating the Big Easy: New Orleans and the Emergence of Modern Tourism, 1918–1945* (2006) that connect representation, race, power relations, and the South. Additional archival research on the handful of guidebook authors she cites might have fleshed out their thought process on how to package the South for an audience of northerners. Nonetheless, *Souvenirs of the Old South* is a valuable addition to the tourism literature and cultural histories of the South.

Mary Rizzo
Rutgers University–Camden


From “Thirty Minute Meals” to “Iron Chef,” Americans are obsessed with watching cooking. Where did this fascination come from? As film scholar Dana Polan argues in *Julia Child’s The French Chef*, Julia Child and her TV show were key to the popularization of food as a televsual subject. But Child, Le Cordon Bleu graduate and co-author of *Mastering the Art of French Cooking* (1961), did not invent the television cooking show. Alongside her husband and producers at WGBH, the Boston public television station, Child contributed important elements to a form that had been in place since TV’s earliest days. In one of the best chapters, Polan traces the cooking show before *The French Chef* (1963), explaining how early shows created the genre’s conventions, like close-ups on the host’s hands interspersed with longer shots. Child borrowed these, but added a pedagogical depth married to a deep joy in cooking that was evident in each episode, which included recipe instruction with a “conceptual” narrative “that situated each step in its contexts and saturated it with broader understanding” (127). That her show coincided with the rise of a new petite bourgeoisie that used food to demonstrate distinction and taste ensured her success.

Equally important was Child herself. Her larger-than-life persona combined with her deep knowledge of French food and the visible pleasure she derived from cook-
ing, eating, and drinking, made her addictive to watch. As fan letters acknowledge, viewers of widely divergent backgrounds liked her spontaneity and strangeness. While she was no cultural rebel (Polan repeatedly mentions that she used industrially produced foods even if she preferred homemade), Child even appealed to people in the counterculture and avant garde who saw her as candid rather than canned.

The fact that mistakes were not edited out of the final shows helped this impression of candor. Rather than being a shellacked sitcom housewife, Child performed realness for the camera. Interestingly given her role in breaking barriers around women’s participation in haute cuisine, Child was no feminist. As she wrote to a male fan, “It’s good to know there are some enthusiastic men at the stove these days; men always have more daring and imagination than women” (97). Child embodied the gender assumptions of her age while stretching them. And, as Polan points out, such gender issues continue to structure TV cooking bifurcated between sexy female hosts and playful male cooks.

The French Chef continued until 1973 when Child retired. While Polan gestures to Child’s legacy, he does not engage with historical memory. What does the Smithsonian say about Child in their exhibit of her TV kitchen? How did the blog, book, and film Julie and Julia (2009) reflect gender and class identity? Such forays would extend the analysis, which is strongest when dealing with the prehistory of the cooking show and the specifics of The French Chef. At times, the book seems hastily written, as with an error that placed Michel Foucault at an important scholarly conference that introduced French theorists to America. However, its use of new archival sources and focus on an important figure in American postwar cultural history makes it an intriguing addition to studies of food and television.

Mary Rizzo

Rutgers University–Camden


It’s tempting to open a review of Courtney Weikle-Mills exhaustive and at times iconoclastic Imaginary Citizens with a zinger like: given how childish American politics are, such a study is timely and insightful. But this is not a zingy book. Rather, it’s a serious survey unlikely to appeal to average readers, let alone voters, but more to specialists in political science and literary studies.

This narrow attraction is understandable, but disappointing because many of the points Weikle-Mills makes are ones it would behoove a more general readership to consider, particularly her conclusions that “when children and young people have been involved in civic activities outside of voting, their actions have been particularly powerful,” and that a “respect for the imaginary dimensions of children’s citizenship has the potential not only to invigorate their participation when they reach adulthood but also to revitalize and transform citizenship” (217).

Weikle-Mills begins her book with a reminder of the metaphorical frames that have long structured the discourse of citizenship in both Europe and America, includ-
ing Mother Britain and the Founding Fathers. She argues convincingly that “metaphors that encourage rights-bearing citizens to imagine themselves as affectionate children of a parental state prompted them to recognize their own interests in the law even when they had not participated directly in its making,” (7) as well as that “the concept of childhood provided a rationale for exclusion” not just of actual children, but also of other classes of people—notably women and slaves—from full participation in the governance of what they were still indoctrinated to consider “their” nation. In doing so, she is persuasive in her suggestion that “metaphors of citizens as children allowed Americans to consider the limits and potentials of imagination and the limits and potentials of rights, as aspects of citizenship” (8).

To illuminate her assertions, Weikle-Mills provides thoughtful readings of such texts as Sarah Fielding’s The Governess (1749) and Hannah Webster Foster’s The Boarding School (1798) among others. She points out how the encouragement of children to love their books was not merely about cultivating literacy, but also about inculcating a respect for the law, and how the depiction of the transition from childhood to adulthood as a simultaneous shift from being a “bad” reader to a “good” one was intended to model the process of maturation into a desirable citizen.

Weikle-Mills also engages—and occasionally respectfully disagrees—with her fellow scholars in the field. She reasonably questions, for instance, Cathy Davidson’s contentions that early American novels “subversively call for the enfranchisement of their readers,” pointing out that these claims are “complicated by the fact that many specifically claim that children and youth are their readership” (5). So too does Weikle-Mills offer a more nuanced evolution of childhood as a concept than Philippe Ariès who famously asserted that childhood was essentially invented in the seventeenth century (10).

In the end, the reader is left to contemplate the limits imposed on children’s citizenship and how similar limits may also constrain the rights of grown-ups in ways more restrictive than most adults care to believe.

Kathleen Rooney
DePaul University


This very timely publication deals with the cultural consequences of the assembly line in the 20th century: It discusses the standardization of products, the changing working patterns and production practices, and their respective critiques. It aims to address the link between culture and technological progress in its specific relation to both the American Dream and the image of “America” around the world. As can be expected from a study of the assembly line, the book’s central storyline starts and ends in Detroit, the place from where it emerged and moved on to change the world; while it is not a study of the urban crisis of the city that was once so intimately tied to the assembly line, Nye’s work connects the changes in Detroit to the transformation of the role of industrial work, without, however, leaving other reasons out.
In ten chapters, the study deals with the invention and emergence of the assembly line, its celebration, distribution and critique, and its status in the globalized world. Overall, the book is interdisciplinary in focus and points to social and environmental consequences of the technology as well as to its literary representations. It contains statistical data and photographs, allowing the reader a glimpse of important moments in technological history. While the study bears the name *America’s Assembly Line*, its focus goes far beyond the United States and also deals with the assembly line and its complex negotiation in the European and Asian contexts. Its main line of argument with regard to these different places is that they did not just adopt the assembly line, but transformed it in important ways. In each of these places, cultural judgments go along with the emergence of mass production, which also became known as Fordism and was discussed under the header of “Americanization” in much of Europe. Nowadays, of course, the United States attempts to learn from other countries, such as Japan, in order to compete on the market. Thus, the assembly line changed within the American context as well, and was criticized under a variety of different signs throughout its history, with regard to the monotony of the work and the perceived threat of mechanization, homogenization and, in the long run, unemployment. At the same time, it was praised, such as with regard to how it shortened workdays and helped along the emergence of a welfare system.

The study very much succeeds in making clear that culture and technology are not opposites, but that they impact each other in significant ways. It discusses the impact of the assembly line not so much from a technological, but from a narrative angle and points out how the assembly line as industrial practice and as cultural phenomenon has, throughout its history, not only shaped perceptions of progress, but also changed organizational patterns and ways of relating to work itself. After all, the story of the American Dream and its failure can be told in one of its many variations along the emergence, powerful moment, and downfall of the assembly line.

Julia Sattler
TU Dortmund University, Germany


May Joseph’s *Fluid New York* is an important addition to the conversation about the environment and life in New York City. This is a thoughtful book whose key metaphor is water: Joseph is persuasive that although New Yorkers were unprepared for superstorm Sandy, water serves to link “public space and private lives” in ways that “defining cartographic lines do not.” She describes and evokes “a dense set of interconnected maps and routes . . . Arab grocers, South Asian cabbies, Caribbean nurses and doorman, African merchants.”

Joseph shows how New York City is a “marine biosphere”; reading Dutch maps from the 17th century, she suggests how the environment has been shaped by water, and how the “language of the street” discussed by Jane Jacobs recreates “transcontinental air and sea routes.” Joseph’s book is better at evoking these powerful ideas than at proving them. She relies heavily not only on maps, but on Russell Shorto’s
popular history *The Island at the Center of the World* (2005), and also on popular protests for Tibet and Falun Gong, in an effort to demonstrate the performative aspect of her argument.

Several of her ideas are stated flatly without interrogation, and this tendency becomes frustrating for the reader; for example, “Manhattan’s density deters any effort at segregation. Its irrepressible flows from the streets resist stagnation.” Maybe, but maybe not. It’s true we have a diverse city, but the segregated schools, for example, occur with Manhattan’s density. Another example: “The disconcerting IF YOU SEE SOMETHING, SAY SOMETHING . . . has cultivated a culture of alarm and nervousness.” Joseph doesn’t say what this culture of alarm consists of, or whether she feels nervous, or whether her sources confirm or disconfirm this idea. Other mistakes also tend to weaken her argument. For example, in a fascinating discussion of the African Burial Ground National Monument, she says it is “on the corner of Duane and Reade Streets.” It’s not. It is on Duane Street, but those streets are parallel. Such details are not trivial. Joseph says she “wrote this book as a memoir of downtown Manhattan,” and the conflicting demands of memoir and scholarship tend to make the writing turgid at times. For example, in her preface set on September 11th: “Billowing smoke. Scorching flames interrupt the skyline. . . .” Smoke is always billowing, and any undergraduate writing student should know not to repeat what we’ve seen or heard on television. At the crux of her main argument, she says: “a culture of fluid urbanism is under way.” Of all the verbs to choose, I wonder about “is under way,” especially when the subject is water.

Nonetheless, *Fluid New York* would be useful in any course about the history of New York City. It could be paired well with Sharon Zukin’s *Naked City* (2011) or Marshall Berman’s *New York Calling* (2007). For scholars interested in how the environment shapes and is shaped by urban life and culture, Joseph’s book deepens our understanding.

Sean Singer

Rutgers University–Newark


Pearl James, associate Professor of English at the University of Kentucky, continues her work on World War I in *The New Death: American Modernism and World War I*, where she examines the representation of war in the novels of four modernist writers: Willa Cather’s *One of Ours* (1923), F. Scott Fitzgerald’s *The Great Gatsby* (1925), Ernest Hemingway’s *A Farewell to Arms* (1929), and William Faulkner’s *Sartoris* (1929). Adopting Winifred Kirkland’s term “the new death,” which refers to the unprecedented scale of death caused by the War, James enquires into modernism’s vision of the New Death that highlights a cultural paradox: the presence and invisibility of death caused by war.

Through historicization and close reading of these canonical novels, James shows how these narratives “refigure, omit and aestheticize the violent death of young men in the aftermath of World War I” (9). Her ambition is to include the war in the
interpretation of these novels in terms of melancholia and loss since it “shapes the thematic and formal ways that these writers represent damage, loss and wounded masculinity in their texts” (9). Thus James pores over the historical source of death but also involves the gender dimension tracing how cultural norms of masculinity complicate the work of death, which can only be an “unsatisfactory business” (22) within the context of war. As male characters cannot tell their stories and cultural norms forbid the representations of abject male bodies, suffering is displaced onto the female ones.

Not only suffering but responsibility for the war seems to be transferred onto women. In her feminist reading of One of Ours, James underlines Cather’s ambivalent depiction of gender which pictures women both as empowered by the war yet also monstrous, thus ironically authorizing “the misogyny that has marked [the novel’s] critical reception” (60).

If the porousness of Cather’s war narrative absorbed the era’s anxieties, The Great Gatsby also absorbed and regendered the violence of war. Using trauma theory and genetic criticism, James presents Nick Carraway as a shell-shocked soldier who through Gatsby’s story can remember and partially heal from his trauma. The violence of war death is displaced onto the grotesqueness of Myrtil’s dead body.

Likewise, in A Farewell to Arms the most “memorable death in the novel is Catherine Barkley’s” (120); Hemingway relocates the abject on the “figure of the nurse […] and away from men” (121). If Nick Carraway is for James a homodiegetic narrator, Frederic Henry is an emotionally unreliable narrator, as his factually accurate account of the war downplays the killing that occurred there. Hemingway, a war hero, “hews to the line of his culture’s notions of war and masculinity” (137). It is quite interesting the way James uses narratology to back her readings.

James is among the few scholars who consider the World War I as “the crucial context for Faulkner’s development as a modernist writer” (164). Her analysis of Sartoris is introduced by an original architectural analogy which drives home “the inherent difficulty of representing the missing dead” (162). James, using Freudian concepts, digs into the “historical roots of Bayard’s inability to mourn” (175) but sounds a bit contradictory when it comes time to assess the extent of mourning. As in the previous novels, the issue of gender is equally under scrutiny (i.e., women enforcing the codes of masculinity in Sartoris).

James’s study paves the way for further examination of New Death in American literature. In her conclusion, James suggests an enlargement of scope into crime fiction and gangster films, whose consideration as postwar texts could deepen our understanding of how the First World War changed death’s cultural meaning.

Aristi Trendel
Université du Maine, France


Had Cochlear implants been available to deaf people in early nineteenth-century America, our hearing ancestors would hardly have doubted the implants’ good pur-
pose. Deafness was a flaw in the human condition, a restriction, even a burden that evoked pity. That twenty-first century deaf people would develop a culture with its own language, traditions, and values would have been unthinkable. That they would reject Cochlear implants and find living with deafness as valid as living with hearing would have seemed ludicrous.

Rebecca Edwards takes us back to the beginning of the nineteenth century when American deaf education emerged out of the eighteenth-century French schools for the deaf. Following the lead of French educators, Thomas H. Gallaudet and the French deaf teacher Laurent Clerc opened the American School for the Deaf in Hartford, Connecticut, in 1817. Under their direction, the school established manual signing as the sole educational method in their school and in other deaf schools they helped to found throughout the nation.

Making a distinction between Deaf and deaf, Edwards uses the former with its upper case D to refer to deaf culture, and the latter to indicate the physical absence of hearing. She maintains this distinction as she writes about American deaf education beyond its earliest years. As she points out, deaf educators faced the question of how to integrate the English of the hearing majority into what became American Sign Language. Should deaf people learn a version of ALS grounded in English spelling, diction, and syntax, or should they learn ASL with its own language structures? Most educators wanted their deaf students to read and write English, but only to acquire an understanding of the various American cultures ancillary to their own. Other teachers of the deaf, however, insisted that signing conform to English spelling and sentence structure, thus abandoning ASL and its unique grounding for deaf culture. In this context, Edwards explores the formation and character of a “Deaf point of view,” one that abandoned the notion of deafness as a disability.

Beyond the controversy of the proper place of English in deaf culture, a greater threat to manual deaf education became oralism. In Prussian schools for the deaf, oral communication—lip reading and speech—had long been practiced. Americans like Samuel G. Howe and Horace Mann had seen firsthand what they found to be effective deaf education that, as they saw it, brought deaf people into the wider community of speakers and hearers. Edwards traces the concatenated and contentious history of proponents of ALS and of oral communication. As Edwards argues, the champions of integration, like Howe, Mann, and later Alexander Graham Bell, claimed a “superiority of the normal,” which they believed would be good for all deaf people. Deafness, as they saw it, was a flaw that blocked social participation; they entertained no idea that deafness might have a culture of its own.

My only quibble with this superb book is that Edwards, following a tradition begun by Harlan Lane, assumes villainous motives of the champions of oralism. They were wrongheaded, to be sure. But their failure to envision deaf culture came from their commitment to the integration of traditionally devalued people into the dominant culture—the only culture they could imagine. Apart from this quibble, Words Made Flesh is a stimulating, beautifully written, and thoroughly engaging book.

James W. Trent, Jr.

Gordon College
As the old adage goes, “never judge a book by its cover.” However, as an historian of abortion and its technologies, I was immediately intrigued by the cover of Michelle Murphy’s *Seizing the Means of Reproduction: Entanglements of Feminism, Health, and Technoscience* for two reasons: its clever, patterned use of the Del-Em apparatus, a homemade menstrual extractor (and for many American women, a subversive manual suction pregnancy terminator during the period of abortion criminality) that was a byproduct of the self-help/women’s health movement of the 1960s and 1970s; and, the book’s title, which incorporates one of the main goals of this movement—“seizing the means of the reproduction”—from patriarchal hands, just as Marx had called on the proletarian class to seize the “means of production.” The work’s title also serves as a nod to a classic in abortion studies: Pauline Bart’s 1987 article in *Qualitative Sociology*, “Seizing the Means of Reproduction: An Illegal Feminist Abortion Collective—How and Why it Worked,” which traces the development of Jane, the famous grassroots, feminist, Chicago abortion service that operated during the height of the women’s health movement.

If one could mine all this from the cover, the work itself, I reasoned, would yield volumes. My expectations for Murphy’s text were therefore substantial, and I certainly was not disappointed. Continuing where works such as Sheryl Burt Ruzek’s *The Women’s Health Movement: Feminist Alternatives to Medical Control* (1979) and Sandra Morgen’s *Into Our Own Hands: The Women’s Health Movement in the United States, 1969–1990* (2002) end, *Seizing the Means of Reproduction* reexamines the women’s health movement of the 1970s and 80s through a feminist technoscience framework made possible by the epistemological shifts that have occurred in technology studies over the past decade.

While much of the material explored in the work itself is not “new,” *per se* (an entire literature exists on the women’s health movement, especially on its self-help strands), Murphy’s refreshing theoretical approach exposes previously unexamined critical junctures, in particular the tension between feminism and technology, and the reality that while 1970s feminists seeking to seize reproductive technologies recognized the political power of what they were doing, they often overlooked the racial power-dynamics of the technologies in question. This became a concern when, as Murphy’s scholarship elucidates, American “second wave” feminist healthcare activism and self-help technologies (such as the plastic speculum and Del-Em apparatus) went transnational and were deployed, usually by other feminists, NGOs, and mechanisms of globalized (often capitalist) biopower, to undergird late-twentieth century phenomena such as the expansion of American empire/imperialism, population control/neoeugenics, and political movements (e.g., neoliberalism).

Murphy’s work not only makes a significant contribution to our understanding of how reproductive technologies have been politically, socially, culturally and racially transformed and maneuvered since the 1970s, but it also elegantly, and intricately, conveys how the “economy of reproduction” functions in both the developed and
developing worlds, especially in the age of genetic engineering, cloning, sex-selection, and continuing contraceptive battles.

Tanfer Emin Tunc
Hacettepe University, Turkey


The subtitle of this fascinating book suggests how Cristobal Silva intends to bring together the burgeoning field of medical history and epidemiology with literary criticism to interrogate not only the first century of colonial settlement but the field of New England studies itself. Silva hopes to explore a framework for understanding the mechanics of colonial epidemics as well as the narrative and theological practices that arose from them. “An epidemiology of narrative,” Silva argues, “describes an analytical framework that charts the genealogy of New England’s literary history according to the temporal and geographical specificity of epidemical outbreaks—a specificity that relates to shifting migration patterns and immunological conditions over time as much as it does to factionalism, political intrigue, and religious orthodoxy” (13). Turning our attention from the New England “Mind,” in other words, Silva is fascinated by the specificity of New England bodies and by the rhetorical practices that were formed by people and communities in sickness and in health during the first century of colonial settlement.

Silva offers perceptive and sometimes counterintuitive readings of key episodes and texts that in outlines will largely be familiar to scholars of early New England but which will seem less familiar after engaging this book, as Silva’s epidemiological analysis allows for new questions and new lines of inquiry. He begins with the 1616–1619 epidemics that killed up to 95 percent of the indigenous inhabitants of New England before the first wave of Puritan settlement. “Epidemics certainly facilitated settlement in New England,” Silva remarks, but they also provided settlers with justification narratives, “with the language through which to understand and legitimate their migration” and colonization (26). Next, he turns to the epidemiological rhetoric that informed the Antinomian Crisis of the 1630s and the debates about separatism and congregationalism among the settlers themselves, demonstrating how Antinomianism was pathologized as a “figural epidemic” by its opponents (76). In both cases, which are key moments in the history of the New England colonies, the rhetorical practices of epidemiology came to enact the politics of conquest and schism. Where the first generation of Puritan settlers saw indigenous susceptibility to disease as providential justification for their enterprise, meanwhile, the mid-century epidemics among Anglo-Americans undermined that certainty, reflected in the evolution of the jeremiad form and the debates about the halfway covenant; this is the subject of the third section of the book. Finally, Silva devotes a fascinating chapter to the smallpox epidemic in Boston in 1721, in which Cotton Mather features so prominently.

Silva’s analysis is richly rooted in the historiography of early New England, from Williston Walker to Perry Miller to contemporary scholars in both medical history and literary studies such as Priscilla Wald and Louise Breen. Non-specialists may find the
interiority of these debates to be difficult to navigate (and in fact Silva himself “sheepishly” apologizes for reviving scholarly conversations that are in some cases more than fifty years old [71]), but specialists will find much to appreciate. Silva’s readings of the 1616–1619 epidemics and of the 1721 Boston Inoculation Crisis, the episodes that bookend his monograph, are particularly interesting in this regard because his use of epidemiological theory cuts against the grain of conventional interpretations, reclaiming some of the erased narratives—the “counter-epidemiologies”—of indigenous peoples and Africans who were the subjects of colonial appropriation. The book is challenging, rewarding, and highly recommended.

William Van Arragon The King’s University College, Canada


In Making Art Panamerican, Claire F. Fox argues that from the mid-1930s through the early 1970s, we can trace significant changes in PanAmerican aesthetic perspectives and hemispheric geopolitics by examining Cold War cultural diplomacy. Throughout the text Fox highlights the complexity of the conversation with Cold War aesthetics with the particular backdrop of Mexican muralism. She also references the homogeneity of corporate and national interest in hemispheric security and identity with actions that initially minimized fascism and eventually minimized communism. Fox is highly successful in describing the relationships and conflicts between various individuals and institutions in the visual art world. She traces changes in aesthetic movements through interactions between the Office of Inter-American Affairs (OIAA), the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), and the birth of the Pan American Union visual arts division (PAU). She details the relationships between key stakeholders like Alfred Barr Jr. (MoMA), Gómez Sicre (Cuban artist and PAU director), and Nelson Rockefeller (politician, corporate leader, art enthusiast).

While the microcosm of these institutions is described with care, the larger world of Cold War politics is sometimes lost. At points, Fox is successful in putting the high art world in larger political context. For instance, she nicely describes the impact of both the Red Scare and the Lavender Scare on artists involved in the PAU. She convincingly explains that some artists, particularly Gómez Sicre, were impacted more by the Lavender Scare than the overarching fear of communism. While the artists’ political ideologies and identities were acceptable within the U.S. containment, their gender identities were not. While this discussion broached broader U.S. political and cultural policy, discussion of U.S. racial policy was omitted from much of the analysis. Including it would have enriched the readers’ understanding. During the early to mid-twentieth century, racial civil rights were clearly on the forefront of U.S. domestic and foreign policy. While Fox includes discussion of imperialism, ideology and geopolitics, contemporary U.S. racial policy and ensuing Cold War negotiations also needed to be addressed. This omission is clear especially in contrast to the most successful chapter in the monograph which does contain these topics.
In the last chapter, Fox analyzes the significance of the 1968 HemisFair held in San Antonio, Texas. While the event designers started with intent to focus on high art, because of negotiations around the policies of race, culture, ideology and economics, the HemisFair ends up including a variety of artistic expressions. The discussion presents an analysis of aesthetic and political interests from a variety of perspectives and traces how aesthetic movements and national identities were influenced and eventually presented to an international audience. It was an excellent analysis to complete the study.

Making Art Panamerican is a thoroughly researched study of important institutions in the high art world during the Cold War. It brings together themes of Cold War aesthetics and a PanAmerican identity that clearly need exploration. It is recommended reading for specialists in cultural diplomacy, Latin American Studies and art history.

Sharon R. Vriend-Robinette
Davenport University


Greg Olson has given Americanists a unique biographical portrait of one of the first and most famous women folklorists, Mary Alicia Owen (1850–1935). An archivist at the Missouri State Archives, Olson clearly is a regionalist at heart, sensitive to the state’s continuing appreciation of Owen’s contributions as a strong-willed, intellectually inquisitive writer who lived her entire adult life in a St. Joseph home shared with her similarly unmarried sisters, equally devoted to artistic and scientific endeavors. However, Olson also illuminates the wider context of Owen’s life as a Vassar-educated, southern woman of the Gilded Age, raised in a slave-holding family and still racist in her sentiments, yet committed to producing literary representations of the multiethnic borderlands of early Missouri for the world.

Owen is most recognized for her creative stories and descriptions of African American hoodoo practices and amateur salvage ethnography of local indigenous peoples. Mentored by fellow amateur folklorist Charles Godfrey Leland, she conducted fieldwork with local Black conjurers by attending ceremonies, collecting charms and fetishes, and acting as a hoodoo apprentice. Her book, Old Rabbit, the Voodoo, and Other Sorcerers (1893), established her as an international authority on these religious practices, and served to promote transatlantic intellectual fascination in “voodoo” and related African American traditions, even as her unpublished letters reveal contempt for her “superstitious” Black consultants, and acceptance of racial hierarchies and corresponding social practices of the times. Owen’s depictions of Native American history and culture were decidedly more sympathetic, if typical in their romantic characterizations. Here, too, she relied on fieldwork, routinely visiting Sac and Fox communities, soliciting stories and purchasing artifacts directly from Native consultants, culminating in Folk-Lore of the Musquakie Indians of North America (1904). Through this quasi-ethnographic monograph, and separate fictional
melodramas of forced removal and tragic mixed-race affairs, she crafted a regional version of noble savagery and the vanishing Indian—a usable past that continues to influence St. Joseph today, perpetuating white legends and promotional iconography of the area as a paradisiacal Indian burial ground while rendering invisible the persistence of Native people.

One strength of this biography is the author’s description of Owen’s fictional oeuvre—usually published under a pseudonym in nationally prominent magazines—that served as an outlet for her unease with changing gender and social conventions. However, there is only faint attempt to configure her writing into a larger critical framework of how imperialist nostalgia works, or how the emergent professionalization of folklore struggled to confirm cultural differences but resist racial divides and primitivist preoccupations. Particularly glaring is the author’s missed opportunity to connect Owen to Zora Neale Hurston’s later efforts to reclaim a Black perspective on hoodoo from the white imaginary Owen helped create. Nevertheless, Olson’s biography is a noteworthy effort to limn the contributions of an early American folklorist to the history of race and region.

Robert E. Walls
University of Notre Dame


The author of Taken for Grantedness, Rich Ling, is a professor at the IT University of Copenhagen, Senior Research Scientist at the Telenor Research Institute near Oslo, and Adjunct Professor at the University of Michigan. The focus of his research is on the sociological impact of technology. His specific research is the mobile/cell phone, which is also a key part in this publication. The author focuses on how the mobile phone has become woven in our expectations of one another (xi) and how it is currently being taken for granted.

I found his concepts about the interdependencies of the clock, car, and mobile phone and their shared synergies interesting. He presents the concepts of how they became embedded into society and changed the need for interpersonal coordination. It has led me to wonder if mobile communication really makes meetings iterative instead of definite. He states that we can now make allowances for traffic and the accessibility of different locations (10). He follows through with these interdependencies in book and goes into detail with elements.

He begins with the foundational elements of timekeeping and its influence and the reaction of man. Clocks in towers quickly became a part of the technology of profit and management (37), according to Ling. His examples show how the social sense of clock time is a given (39). There is a further investigation into the effects of clocks and timekeeping. Ling addresses the positive and negative aspects in regards to clocks and time management. I gathered that the author’s perspective was rather simple; whether you liked clocks or hated clocks and all the things associated with them, you still have to accept them as a part of your society.
Ling addresses a similar issue with the automobile. Chapter four is titled, “Four-Wheeled Bugs with Detachable Brains,” and does bring a very different picture to mind when you are talking about cars. He follows this chapter with the diffusion of Mobile Communication, and specifically, the mobile/cell phone. It is the most recent society-based standard for keeping in touch with family, friends and coworkers. He concludes that mobile phones have diffused into society such that in developed countries it is rare to find an individual without one. I have to agree with the author on this point. I have traveled to many places and the cell phone can be found in undeveloped countries as well. It is the common threat that can and could tie us all together.

The author concludes his book by commenting on certain aspects concerning the use of mobile phones. He asks questions like: Are we spoiled by the cell phone? Are we abused by the cell phone? Is there a true justification? These are deep concepts to think about. In conclusion, what are our expectations? I conclude, after reading this book, the cell phone can be anything the user wants or needs it to be.

Paula L. Webb
University of South Alabama


In the wake of Supreme Court decisions that expanded civil rights for the LGBT community, Amy Stone’s book is a critical reminder of the social and political obstacles that underscore the victory. Stone’s examination reveals an embedded contradiction associated with social movements in the United States. Mobilization to achieve recognition of civil rights is often threatened by the same mechanisms of direct democracy that claim to celebrate social justice.

The book first presents a perplexing observation that anchors its analysis. The same evening the country celebrated the historic election of Barack Obama in 2008, gay rights activists were simultaneously confronted with the news that California voters had banned same-sex marriage with the passage of the ballot initiative Proposition 8. The campaign against what was commonly referred to as “Prop. 8” had mobilized one of the largest lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer canvasses in the country. Bewildered, the stunned LGBT community and activists had one question: how did the country elect its first African-American president, yet defeat gay rights?

The answer is revealed in the detailed analysis of gay rights ballot initiative campaigns. Stone’s examination of the politics associated with gay rights reveals how the anti-gay movement (and later ballot initiatives) engaged direct democracy to defeat early gay rights measures at the ballot box. Stone explains the strategies the anti-gay movement implemented in the marketplace of ideas to effectively marginalize the LGBT community. After a number of consecutive electoral losses in several battleground states, the LGBT community recognized the need to overcome internal fragmentation and recalibrate its campaign strategies. With the acquisition of necessary resources and organizational professionalization, the LGBT community was able to expand the social movement to have a presence in many key states to support the campaigns necessary to defeat and repeal anti-gay measures.
Stone’s social movement framework is easily transferred to comparable case studies. Stone’s sociological approach is an effective application of social interpretation to political analysis. The sophisticated treatment of historical data for other LGBT ballot initiative campaigns that preceded California’s Proposition 8 aptly demonstrates that large-scale social movements can often sustain political mobilization. Further, this framework provides a utility that reaches across disciplines to expound upon the relationship between political campaigns and social movements. There is a distinction to be made clear between the characteristics of a social movement and those of a political campaign. Stone exemplifies that both are often mutually supportive, but the relationship can also be antagonistic. In this case, the LGBT ballot initiative campaigns aided the growth of the larger social movement. Campaigns, it is argued, can advance a social movement, but it’s also suggested that social movements rarely evolve from political campaigns. It is this distinction that clarifies the reasons for the successes and failures of gay rights at the ballot box. The author suggests there is sustainable LGBT social movement and inquires about how ballot initiative campaigns can strengthen the movement’s presence and nurture its mobilization toward wider political recognition and legal protection of civil rights.

Heather E. Yates

Illinois College