

Book Reviews

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Dirty Harry's America: Clint Eastwood, Harry Callahan, and the Conservative Backlash.</i> By Joe Street. Reviewed by James I. Deutsch. | 109 |
| <i>Martyrs Mirror: A Social History.</i> By David L. Weaver-Zercher. Reviewed by Rebecca Barrett-Fox. | 110 |
| <i>Origins of the Dream: Hughes's Poetry and King's Rhetoric.</i> By W. Jason Miller. Reviewed by John Edgar Tidwell. | 111 |
| <i>Tourist Attractions: Performing Race and Masculinity in Brazil's Sexual Economy.</i> By Gregory Mitchell. Reviewed by Annegret Staiger. | 113 |
| <i>From #BlackLivesMatter to Black Liberation.</i> By Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor. Reviewed by Adam Sztetela. | 114 |
| <i>Cool Characters: Irony and American Fiction.</i> By Lee Konstantinou. Reviewed by Iain Williams. | 115 |
| <i>Desis Divided: The Political Lives of South Asian Americans.</i> By Sangay K. Mishra. Reviewed by Nalini Iyer. | 117 |
| <i>My Dear Boy: Carrie Hughes's Letters to Langston Hughes, 1926–1938.</i> Edited by Carmella M. Williams and John Edgar Tidwell. Reviewed by Sherry Johnson. | 118 |
| <i>Graphic Borders: Latino Comic Books, Past, Present & Future.</i> Edited by Frederick Luis Aldama and Christopher González. Reviewed by Lorna L. Pérez. | 119 |
| <i>Plagiarama! William Wells Brown and the Aesthetic of Attractions.</i> By Geoffrey Sanborn. Reviewed by Cecilia Parnther. | 120 |
| <i>Fish Sticks, Sports Bras, and Aluminum Cans: The Politics of Everyday Technologies.</i> By Paul R. Josephson. Reviewed by Kevin J. Porter. | 122 |
| <i>Terrorizing Latina/o Immigrants: Race, Gender, And Immigration Politics in The Age of Security.</i> By Anna Sampaio. Reviewed by Francisco Delgado. | 123 |
| <i>City of Inmates: Conquest, Rebellion, and the Rise of Human Caging in Los Angeles, 1771–1965.</i> By Kelly Lytle Hernandez. Reviewed by Natalia Molina. | 124 |

108 Book Reviews

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Race and Retail: Consumption Across The Color Line.</i> Edited by Mia Bay and Ann Fabian. Reviewed by E. James West. | 126 |
| <i>Black Mosaic: The Politics of Black Pan-Ethnic Diversity.</i> By Candis Watts Smith. Reviewed by Justin Williams | 127 |
| <i>Atomsics in the Classroom: Teaching the Bomb in the Early Postwar Era.</i> By Michael Scheibach. Reviewed by Robert A. Jacobs. | 128 |

Editorial note: Book reviews are edited for typographical errors, and otherwise are printed as received.

Reviews

DIRTY HARRY'S AMERICA: Clint Eastwood, Harry Callahan, and the Conservative Backlash. By Joe Street. Gainesville: University Press of Florida. 2016.

On August 30, 2012, Clint Eastwood addressed a wildly enthusiastic crowd on the final day of the Republican National Convention in Tampa, Florida. Eastwood's bizarre conversation with an empty chair representing Barack Obama attracted the most media attention in the days that followed. But equally intriguing were the speech's opening and closing remarks, which repeated two phrases famously used by Eastwood's best-known cinematic character, "Dirty Harry" Callahan. Eastwood's first words—after thanking the crowd—were "I know what you are thinking," which references his taunting a bank robber who isn't sure if Callahan fired five or six shots with his .44 Magnum handgun in *Dirty Harry* (1971). Eastwood's ended his speech in Tampa with "Go ahead," which then provoked the convention delegates to roar back in unison, "Make my day!," thereby referencing the catch-phrase used by Callahan in *Sudden Impact* (1983), the third of four sequels that followed the original film.

Eastwood's performance in Tampa not only "reminded listeners of the centrality of Harry Callahan in Eastwood's persona," but also "indicated that Callahan was firmly in the conservative camp, partnering Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan in their quest for the White House" (141), argues Joe Street, a senior lecturer in history at Northumbria University. Although this "conservative camp" may be more multifaceted than Street describes, his book is a well-written and thoroughly engaging analysis of Dirty Harry's origins, cultural history, and legacy. Street incisively explores the key themes expressed in *Dirty Harry* and its four sequels, concluding that "Callahan represents American strength, honor, chivalry, and righteousness while also revealing its bloodlust, lack of respect for the rule book, and fondness for guns" (201).

Dirty Harry's America begins with an assessment of Eastwood's career in the 1950s and 60s, including his earlier collaborations with Don Siegel, who directed Eastwood in three films prior to *Dirty Harry*. Chapter 2 explores the wider political, cultural, and social context of the 1971 film, particularly how it corresponds to the evolution of cinematic private detectives and police officers who go "rogue in single-minded pursuit"

of their antagonists (41), as well as the “so-called urban crisis [that] manifested all of the fears of American liberals in the 1960s” (43). Chapter 3 considers the significance of San Francisco as the setting for the *Dirty Harry* films, particularly the city’s unusual combination of liberalism and cultural tolerance together with its roots in the Old West and the popularity of both Ronald Reagan (then serving as California’s governor) and Richard Nixon (a native Californian then serving as U.S. president).

The book’s final three chapters examine the legacies of *Dirty Harry*—first in the themes that unite the original with its sequels, and then in the ways in which the films continue to resonate in American popular and political culture. Here Street explores Eastwood’s service as mayor of Carmel, his roles in more recent films such as *Gran Torino* (2008), and the references to Callahan in vigilante films such as *Death Wish* (1974), television series such as *Sledge Hammer* (1986–1988), video games such as *Dirty Harry* (1980), and graphic novels such as *Sin City: That Yellow Bastard* (1996).

In short, *Dirty Harry’s America* is an excellent example of American Studies scholarship, which analyzes this cultural phenomenon from multiple perspectives, including class, gender, geography, law, politics, popular culture, race, and sexuality.

James I. Deutsch

Smithsonian Institution

MARTYRS MIRROR: A Social History. By David L. Weaver-Zercher. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. 2016.

Though the demographics of worldwide Anabaptism—a Christian movement that rejects infant baptism and its historic connection to citizenship in a state in favor of adult baptism and the divorcing of church and state—have shifted to South America, Asia, and Africa, their historic roots are in the Netherlands. It was here, in the 1660, that Thieleman J. van Bragt published *Martyrs Mirror*, stories of Christian martyrdom from the time of Jesus. Also known as *The Bloody Theater*, the books takes nearly 2000 pages to cover the stories of the apostles, early Christians, and those who were coming to identify as Anabaptists in the 1500 and 1600s. Approximately 2500 early Anabaptists embraced martyrdom at the hands of both Catholics and Protestants as part of their nonviolent theology. *Martyrs Mirror* collected their suffering in a foundational text for future Mennonites, Amish, and Hutterites, including the many worldwide who do not trace their ancestry to the Netherlands.

David J. Weaver-Zercher’s *Martyrs Mirror: A Social History* examines how this book informs the lives of the roughly 2.1 million Anabaptists in the world today—a group well-represented in the US and Canada, primarily due to a high birth and retention rate among more conservative believers. Weaver-Zercher’s book considers the diverse and contested ways that the book has been used: as a source of gruesome bedtime stories that encourage children to solidify their faith, as a resource that helps forge ethnic unity, as proud evidence of the group’s dedication to peacemaking. Weaver-Zercher offers a history of Anabaptist martyrdom and the initial production of the book, but American studies scholars will likely be most interested in what happens when the text comes to America.

After taking readers through the American history of the book, Weaver-Zercher explores the ways that “tradition-minded” and “assimilated” Anabaptists—those who live lives in greater and lesser tension with the non-Anabaptist world—use *Martyrs Mirror* to their own ends. These two chapters usefully illuminate one of the book’s earlier points: that *Martyrs Mirror*, like all religious texts, has always been used to promote the

view of the one laying claim to its power. Because “*Martyrs Mirror* has functioned, and continues to function, as a measure of Christian faithfulness” (x), those who can make the greatest claim on it are also the ones defining “faithfulness”—likely a cause of the many fractures among Anabaptists. Conservative Anabaptists read it to find justification for strict sectarianism and deference to the community of believers. Among “assimilated” Anabaptists, the distinctive history of the faith may be downplayed, even as the parts of its theology that align with progressive politics—such as individual agency in opposing state-led violence—are forwarded; in these settings, the role of *Martyrs Mirror*, “is both more muted and more complicated” (239). The stories from *Martyrs Mirror*, particularly the story of Dirk Willems, who was martyred after rescuing a bounty hunter who fell into icy water while pursuing him, are used not just for personal piety but for political projects both within and outside the church.

Most compelling is Weaver-Zercher’s chapter on what *Martyrs Mirror* means in a world in which Anabaptists now reside not primarily in the safety of the US and Canada but in places where violence is part of a daily life. In April 2017, Mennonite Michael Sharp, a white American with long family roots in the Mennonite faith, was working with a Swedish colleague and their Congolese guides as part of a UN investigation into human rights abuses in the Democratic Republic of Congo when he, along with his companions, was murdered. As shocking as Sharp’s death was to Mennonites, they had a working martyrology to make sense of his death, a history in which to insert it. Today, according to the Mennonite Mission Network, more than 5000 Congolese Mennonites—more than twice the number of European Anabaptists killed during the Radical Reformation—remain in hiding for their own safety. Zercher-Weaver’s analysis inspires readers to ask what stories of martyrdom might mean to a people locked in one of the world’s longest civil wars, how a history of colonization and exploitation contribute to those understandings, and how the perspectives of oppressed peoples today may change the reading that the descendants of white European Mennonites might have of their ancestors’ stories.

Weaver-Zercher reminds readers that “[m]any things go into the making of a religious tradition, and most of them have nothing to do with printed texts” (315). While the author’s contribution in showing how *Martyrs Mirror* shaped the meaning and practice of Anabaptism is itself a worthy project, Weaver-Zercher’s larger contribution is his argument that those other “many things” also shape the meaning of sacred books. American studies scholars may wish for more robust treatment of some of those factors—particularly race, especially in relation to Dutch leadership in the global slave trade during the period of Anabaptist formation, and gender—but they will find in *Martyrs Mirror: A Social History* a model for clear, engaging scholarly writing that asks challenging questions about an understudied group in a scholarly project that will be useful in religious history, sociology of religion, Anabaptist studies, and print and book studies.

Rebecca Barrett-Fox

Arkansas State University

ORIGINS OF THE DREAM: Hughes’s Poetry and King’s Rhetoric. By W. Jason Miller. Gainesville: University Press of Florida. 2015.

In a meticulous combination of close reading, biblical exegesis, and literary analysis, W. Jason Miller, in *Origins of the Dream: Hughes’s Poetry and King’s Rhetoric*, offers an intriguing reinterpretation of Langston Hughes by demonstrating the influence Hughes’s poetry exerted on the rhetoric of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Miller focuses on the meta-

phor of the dream, which, in his formulation, derives principally from three of Hughes's poems: "Youth," "I Dream a World," and "A Dream Deferred." King, according to this argument, rewrote, revised, recycled, paraphrased, alluded to, rewrote, merged voices, and sampled Hughes's works for the thematic and rhetorical force to embellish his own sermons and speeches. The fundamental premise authorizing the unrestrained appropriation of Hughes's poetry is that, in the sermonic tradition of the old Black preacher, nothing is really new under the sun, freeing up preachers to borrow liberally from all sources, including each other.

The path Miller charts from King's evolving poetic sensibility to the rhetorical tour de force in the "I Have a Dream" speech begins by exploring King's predisposition toward the poetic, an aesthetic vision that derives from a broad, eclectic reading into the Western tradition made famous by Wordsworth, Milton, Shelley, Arnold, Swinburne, and many more. Inspired by their beauty and expressive power, King would rewrite their words for use in cultivating his own rhetorical prowess. Miller is a bit tentative, however, in noting Hughes's acknowledgment of King's use of his poems. Publicly, Hughes thanked King for his kind words and the use he made of the poems in his sermons and speeches. More personally, though, Hughes was thought to be a bit peevish about King's often failure to acknowledge Hughes's authorship of the poems. Could there have been, in Miller's view, a subtle jibe Hughes takes at King because his poetry helped to raise sums of money for the civil rights movement but none was given to the poems' creator?

Miller is considerably stronger in confronting the challenge of reading King's sermons and speeches line by line to glean embedded instances of Hughes's poetic language. Metaphors from "A Dream Deferred," for instance, appear in King's sermons as early as 1956, in phrases such as "a festering sore." This use, however, is more than merely quoting a vivid image; it signals both idea and framing device. Here, it applies to the debilitating effects of racial segregation—on both the ones suffering discrimination and the ones committing the discrimination. Methodically, Miller makes judicious use of poetic and rhetorical analytical tools to establish connections between Hughes's poetry and King's prose. The result is a persuasive rendering of Hughes's influence on King.

To appreciate fully the results Miller achieves in this study, one need only examine its trajectory. He patiently retraces King's ultimate exposition of the dream metaphor, which culminates in its iconic use in the speech popularly known as "I Have a Dream." Miller masterfully shows how King appropriates and submerges the poetic impulses of Hughes's poems in this well-known speech. From all accounts, King's prepared text did not move the audience that hot August day in the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom. Spurred by Mahalia Jackson's entreaty—"Tell them about the dream, Martin!"—King put notes aside and spoke from memory and the heart. Listeners had little or no inkling of Hughes's resonance in the background of this speech. But therein lay the deft display of King's creativity. In making artful use of the metaphor, he made the speech his own.

Origins of the Dream is not without flaw. The assertion that Hughes engaged in a life-long fascination with communism or socialism seemingly begs the issue. While Hughes was indeed a political subversive, the claim he was inspired by "Red" ideology requires more evidence. Rhetorically, the idea functions nicely to set up a tension between Hughes and King, one that King resolves by submerging the political idea in the deep structure of his own poetic vision. Similarly, the flipped script needs further work. According to Miller, King supposedly influenced Hughes, but his supportive evidence is not as strong or convincing. Nevertheless, *Origins of the Dream* is an impressive study. Miller wonderfully extends our understanding into the relationship between two very gifted writer/orators. One of the study's blurbists perhaps offers the best assessment:

“[T]his book is an exemplary model for future inquiries about the confluence of thought, poetry, and social action.”

John Edgar Tidwell

University of Kansas

TOURIST ATTRACTIONS: Performing Race and Masculinity in Brazil’s Sexual Economy. By Gregory Mitchell. Chicago University Press. 2015.

Tourist Attractions offers the reader an intimate look at American men who travel to Brazil in search of commercial sex with straight butch men. Conducting ethnographic fieldwork for more than 16 months between 2005 and 2016, in Rio, Manaus, and Bahia, Mitchell combines anthropological theory and performance studies to disentangle the sexual economy in this transnational mirror cabinet of racialized sexual desires and “commissioned performances.” In the burgeoning literature on global sex tourism, gay sex tourism has received much less attention. *Tourist Attractions* provides a powerful contribution to the small number of studies on gay sex tourism in Latin America, adding profound insights into the affective and contradictory dimensions of this exchange few others have accomplished.

The gay American tourists in search of Latin hypermasculine garotos are middle class men with a disposable income that allows them to travel internationally. A vulnerable sexual minority, Mitchell shows how gay tourists have become a global economic player, a “turbo consumer” with a reputation for raising economic activity and thus courted by national governments and multinational corporations alike. While the gay tourists tend to be middle age and older, most with college or advanced graduate degrees, the *garotos* whose services they seek tend to be in their late teens to mid-thirties, and, for the most part heterosexual.

Mitchell portrays a scene of global sex tourism that challenges many stereotypes of prostitution, particularly those of the exploited victim and the callous John. Thus, while garotos are from poor backgrounds, sex work is one of very few paths that allows them to access middle class consumerism; and although some despise the way clients treat them, others feel that it is they who are exploiting the clients, rather than the other way round. Even the definition of prostitution becomes difficult, when sexual exchanges are not reimbursed with cash but gifts, when strong affective bonds are involved, when relationships extend over several years. In fact, while Mitchell does not dismiss the importance of erotic encounters driven purely by material gain, he provides multiple examples of tourists and garotos having deep attachments to each other, some even forging new and unconventional types of romantic relationships and creating transnational extended families.

The book illustrates powerfully the fluidity of sexual identity and identification. While the international marketing of Latin sexuality has produced distinct appetites for a hypersexual Latin masculinity, garotos need to learn how to perform to these expectations of their clients in order to make themselves “legible” to the client and to arouse them. But garotos also need to muster up their own arousal, for which they routinely use heterosexual porn and negotiate how to interpret their own *tesao*—vaguely translated as ‘desire’—that might arise during sex with a client. The Latin concept of “ativo-passivo”—in which the kind of sex one engages determines one’s sexual identity—here seems to clash with the so-called “egalitarian” concept of the American tourist, in which one’s choice of sexual partner determines one’s sexuality. But, as Mitchell shows, although the “Latin concept” is in use, particularly among lower class and rural Brazilians, it is neither rigid nor overly determining, with men who ostentatiously subscribe to the active, penetrative role, at times finding themselves enjoying sex with clients and taking on the passive role, even

though they continue to identify as heterosexual and—outside of prostitution—maintain sexual relationships only with women.

One of the central findings of Mitchell's study is what he calls the “paradox of queer desire:” the widespread belief among tourists that the garotos who claim to be heterosexual—and therefore only willing to perform penetration—are in fact closeted gays in need of liberation. However, the more a garoto is likely to express genuine pleasure with and affection for his client, the more the client will lose interest and search for a new prospective convert. This paradox, in which the object of desire becomes obsolete after successful conquest, Mitchell shows, is replicated in the eco-tourists' search of the authentic Indian in Manaus, which tends to destroy the very basis of authenticity that he tries to capture, or the Afro-American roots tourist in Bahia who tries to reunite with a broader, and more authentic African experience, only to alienate their Afro-Brazilian interlocutors who do not share the tourist's sense of a unified Black identity or who might even consider the African American as white. Although such a trope of conquest is not altogether new, but a familiar feature of a type of male sexuality more broadly, it is perplexing to find it between hypermasculine sex workers and American gay tourists.

Tourist Attractions tackles a difficult subject: the intimate sexual economies between men inserted in very different places and positions, juggling contradictory layers of stigmatized and privileged identities. It takes a highly reflective and perceptive anthropologist to get respondents to open up about these most personal aspects of their lives. Mitchell has accomplished this, providing the reader a precious insight into a site of transnational commercial sex that will greatly advance our conversations about racialized sexualities and sexualized races within the Americas. This exceptional ethnography belongs on the reading list not only of scholars and students of anthropology, gender and queer studies, but also to those interested in American Studies and the intra-continental sexual economies within the Americas.

Annegret Staiger

Clarkson University

FROM #BlackLivesMatter TO BLACK LIBERATION. By Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor. Chicago: Haymarket Books. 2016.

Similar to Herbert Marcuse's *An Essay on Liberation* (1969), Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor's latest contribution is a timely and much needed intervention. Both intellectually rigorous and accessible, *From #BlackLivesMatter to Black Liberation* is a historical exposition of the conditions that contributed to the reemergence of Black radicalism in the United States. It is also a persuasive case that #BLM's fight against racism must also be a fight against capitalism.

In chapter one, Taylor looks at the mutually reinforcing ideas of American exceptionalism and “culture of poverty.” Through a meticulous analysis of public policy and political rhetoric, she explains that the manufactured connection between Black poverty and Black culture allows conservatives and liberals to portray America as a country where anyone can make it. The oppression experienced by Blacks is imagined as a failure of the Black family and Black role models, not a failure of the state. This absolves the federal government from intervening through social welfare.

In chapter two, Taylor locates the emergence of “colorblindness” as a reactionary political theory. For Taylor, this “ideological tool, initially wielded by conservatives in the Nixon era to resist the growing acceptance of ‘institutional racism’ as the central explanation for Black inequality,” denies structural racism and perpetuates a politics that blames Blacks for their own suffering (17-18). With a careful attention to Black history,

Taylor looks at the ways that this narrative became dominant in the late 1960s after the decline of the radical Black power movements.

Chapter three, “Black Faces in High Places,” makes the convincing case that more Black people in positions of power will do nothing to alleviate the institutional racism that permeates America. As she historicizes the rise of Black politicians, police chiefs, and elites Taylor evinces the reality that this “progress” has not blunted mass incarceration, police brutality, the destruction of public housing, and other areas where Black Americans suffer disproportionality. Chapter four elaborates the specifics of “The Double Standard of Justice” that exists in America. While chapter five, “Barack Obama: The End of an Illusion” builds on chapter three with an examination of Obama’s failure to address “critical issues facing African Americans” (19). Chapters six and seven look at the rise of #BLM under the first Black president as a sign that Black Americans are again embracing “institutional racism” as a schematic for understanding reality. They are also engaging in forms of activism that diverge from party politics.

A central strength of *#BlackLivesMatter* is Taylor’s meticulous demystification of the meritocratic myth that pervades American culture and politics. Like Michelle Alexander and Cedric Johnson, she utilizes demographic statistics, rhetorical analysis, and comparative-historical analysis to illuminate the new guises of institutional racism. Most importantly, she targets not just conservative politicians, but liberals like Obama and Al Sharpton who propagandize American exceptionalism, “culture of poverty” narratives, and meagre reformist policies that can be assimilated into a political-economy of racism and class privilege. Taylor’s intelligent rebuke of prominent antiracist author Tim Wise alone makes her book worth reading.

Ultimately, Taylor makes a compelling final argument that antiracist movements must also be socialist. Capitalism is a system that disproportionality exploits minorities, but it is also a system that exploits people of all races and ethnicities. For Taylor, police are the repressive state apparatus that recreates class power as it systematically disempowers and persecutes the poor. As Black Americans are overrepresented among the poorer classes, it is unsurprising that they are disproportionality targeted at a higher rate than whites. Yet, while it is important to recognize these disparities, such differences do “not say much about who benefits from the inequality of our society” (212). For Taylor, a political-economy built on slavery, mass incarceration, the destruction of the social welfare state, and *wage slavery*—“the pivot around which all other inequalities and oppressions turn” (206)—will not be disrupted by Black elites who represent the interests of the ruling class. It will only be challenged by an intersectional politics that sees Black liberation as part of human liberation from capitalism.

Adam Szetela

Berklee College of Music

COOL CHARACTERS: Irony and American Fiction. By Lee Konstantinou. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 2016.

In this timely and well-researched monograph, Lee Konstantinou (University of Maryland, College Park) offers a literary history of irony in post-World War II U.S. fiction. Rather than opting to treat irony as just a “trope or figure,” Konstantinou (invoking Randolph Bourne) implements a “characterological approach” that illustrates how irony might also be construed as “a life, a specific (often oppositional and critical) way of being in and interpreting the world” (xi). Dividing the book into five sections that correspond to distinct “characterological types” that he identifies as emerging since 1945—the Hipster; the Punk; the Believer; the Coolhunter; the Occupier—Konstantinou seeks to chart the

“transition from irony to postirony” through these figures (36). In doing so, his book also seeks to engage with ongoing debates about periodization; in his assertion that postmodernism has “at some unspecified time, achieved a newly historical status,” Konstantinou joins the growing number of scholars aiming to name “our post-postmodern moment,” offering “postirony” as his contribution (3, x, 37).

The first half of the book is dedicated to irony, with chapter one offering discerning readings of Ralph Ellison’s *Invisible Man* (1952) and Thomas Pynchon’s early texts in relation to the Hipster, whilst chapter two engages with the radical aesthetics of the Punk, William S. Burroughs, and Kathy Acker. In recent years, it has become something of a critical shibboleth to assert that irony was inherently rebellious or countercultural during the middle decades of the twentieth century, only to be co-opted and corrupted by marketing and media gurus at some point in the 1980s (a claim perhaps most famously propounded by David Foster Wallace, the guiding light of *Cool Characters*). Konstantinou is keen to challenge this commonplace, however, noting that this countercultural stance was in some ways already complicit with the systems—in the above cases, the liberal establishment and neoliberal economics, respectively—that it ostensibly emerged in response to. Whilst his argument is detailed and persuasive, Konstantinou’s engagement with irony occasionally becomes subordinate to his probing of possibilities for countercultural rebellion, especially in the latter chapter. Indeed, this criticism could be extended to the book as a whole; the concept of irony itself is sometimes only tacitly implied, with the broad and impressive extent of Konstantinou’s research occasionally obscuring his own authorial voice. Accordingly, a more explicit sense of continuity and narrative progression would have enhanced the book as a whole. Moreover, irony’s cultural dominance is just accepted as a given, rather than challenged (of course, in a study devoted to irony one would not perhaps expect a refutation of its importance, and yet some dissenting opinions might have been gestured to).

Granted, Konstantinou is not alone in this; irony is in danger of becoming a catch-all term. Indeed, this is engaged with directly in the second section of the book—“postirony”—where Konstantinou is at most perceptive and challenging. Chapter three looks at the work of Dave Eggers and David Foster Wallace, and their emergence at a time when “capitalism’s Cold War victory, individual irony, and philosophical antifoundationalism merged into a single discourse” (168). Through a number of excellent close-readings, Konstantinou shows how these authors respond to their milieu by attempting “to reconstruct our capacity to believe,” giving rise to the figure of “the believer”: a character type that “knows that there’s no ontological ground for his faith, but he paradoxically needs to pray anyway, to live *as a believer*, in order to render life liveable” (176, 166). This is not a rejection of irony *per se*, but an attempt to move beyond positions that could be framed as “uncritically earnest or naively nostalgic” (8). Again, the general implication that neoliberal capitalism, irony, and postmodernism/poststructuralism have become conjoined—another example of a further emergent critical consensus—is perhaps overplayed, but Konstantinou’s chosen examples seamlessly echo his claim. Konstantinou’s most important insight, however, might inadvertently prove to be his identification of Wallace and Eggers’ strategy as a strictly “literary means” to belief, implying that its viability in “reality” might prove to be more contentious.

In the fourth chapter and conclusion, Konstantinou investigates the “Coolhunter” and the “Occupier” as further possible avenues for resisting the co-option of irony by consumer society, acknowledging that whilst on one hand “calls for postirony . . . express a desire . . . for the unco-optable,” on the other hand, “reified cultural values often constitute the ‘real’ thing” (229, 225). In this perceptive channelling of Timothy Bewes’ *Reification*,

Konstantinou posits that there might be a need to “occupy” both worlds, an ability to adopt “both a critically distant and aesthetically invested sense of the market and the world” (270). As Konstantinou acknowledges, there might be some “critical uneasiness” with this position, but this is perhaps owing to the implications of his claim, rather than the manner in which he reaches his conclusions.

Whilst the book is—Ellison and Acker aside—overwhelmingly focused on white male authors—exacerbating Christy Wampole’s claim in the *New York Times* that “ironic living is a first-world problem”—the second half of the book in particular should prove vital for scholars of contemporary U.S. literature. This is not only due to Konstantinou’s thought-provoking analyses of individual texts, but in the degree to which the book points toward a growing consensus around certain critical positions: the cultural dominance of irony in the twentieth and early-twenty-first centuries; the equivocation of irony, neoliberal capitalism, and postmodernism/poststructuralism; the emergence of an identifiable “post-postmodern” movement. Konstantinou’s book is an essential touchstone for those looking to cement, or, perhaps more importantly, challenge, those claims.

Iain Williams

University of Edinburgh, UK.

DESI DIVIDED: The Political Lives of South Asian Americans. By Sangay K. Mishra. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 2016.

Sangay Mishra’s book breaks new ground in South Asian American studies because he moves beyond the work of earlier scholars such as Vijay Mishra, Kamala Visweswaran, Monisha Das Gupta who had critiqued the model minority discourse used to frame the experiences of South Asian Americans. Mishra builds on this earlier work but provides a systematic analysis of the divergences and schisms within the ethnic group to study how this immigrant community has mobilized politically in recent years and in particular post 9/11. Based on interviews with South Asians in New York city and Los Angeles as well as analysis of national data from the 2000-2001 Pilot Study of the National Asian American Political Survey and the 2008 National Asian American Survey, Mishra looks at the patterns of political participation amongst South Asians both within the US and transnationally.

The book begins with a socio-political history of South Asians in the U.S. which is familiar territory for those working in the field but necessary to introduce the book’s overall project. He continues with an analysis of theories of ethno-racial mobilization and their relevance to the study of South Asian Americans. He then proceeds to explore post 9/11 racial targeting of South Asians and how that shapes political mobilization. The book continues with an examination of dominant modes of political mobilization amongst South Asians and concludes with two chapters that examine the community’s transnational political engagement and how diasporic nationalism influences the members’ engagement with U.S. politics.

This study is timely and conceptualized well. As an economically powerful and rapidly growing community, South Asian Americans are increasingly active in politics at the local, regional, and national levels. However, Mishra’s major intervention is that the South Asian American community is not a monolith and that national origin, religion, caste, and class are important factors that complicate how we understand the community. This approach of considering vectors of identity within the group is necessary in the evolution of South Asian American studies and has a significant methodological impact on the field.

There are a couple of aspects of this study that could have been nuanced. The first is the question of gender. Although Mishra does devote about a dozen pages to social justice politics in chapter four and addresses how organizations like Sakhi and Manavi among

others that did ground breaking work on domestic violence prevention and advocacy and provided an avenue for political mobilization, the issues of gender, sexuality, and working class issues are lumped into this section and the analysis feels perfunctory. Is gender not a major factor if turbaned Sikh men and hijabi women were targets of racial violence post 9/11? It is not clear what percentage of respondents to the interviews were women? The discussion of South Asian racialization needs to be an intersectional one that accounts for gender and sexuality in the formation of race. The second issue is that of national origins. Mishra admits in his introduction that despite his best attempts, the study is dominated by Indian American issues. He justifies this because Indian Americans are numerically the largest amongst South Asians and also because South Asian American studies as a field has not produced enough scholarship on Pakistani, Bangladeshi, and other smaller South Asian communities. Both these reasons are real and important, but this Indo-centrism skews the argument. In particular, much of the chapter on diasporic nationalism is Indo-centric. Had Mishra engaged in a discussion of a smaller South Asian community such as the Sri Lankan American community and their diasporic nationalism, a more nuanced picture would have emerged. Sri Lankan Tamils who escaped a decades-long civil war have had an active and different form of diasporic nationalism during and after the civil war. Does the different post-independence political history of India and Sri Lanka impact diasporic nationalism differently?

These critiques of the question of gender and Indo-centrism do not take away from the immense value of Mishra's scholarship. This book pushes those of us working in South Asian American studies to engage deeply with the schisms within the community and to develop theories and methodologies that account for how gender, national origin, class, and religion shape our work.

Nalini Iyer

Seattle University

MY DEAR BOY: Carrie Hughes's Letters to Langston Hughes 1926–1938. Edited by Carmella Williams and John Tidwell. Georgia: University of Georgia Press. 2013.

The mother-daughter relationship is said to be one that often is fraught with complexities. The relationship that Carrie Hughes had with her son, renowned poet and author, Langston Hughes, demonstrates that the mother-son relationship too, can have major complexities. *In My Dear Boy: Carrie Hughes's Letters to Langston Hughes 1926–1938* editors Carmella M. Williams and John Edgar Tidwell present a collection of Carrie's letters to her son over the course of 12 years at the beginning of the 20th century. The goal they outline is to do that which has yet to be done: "probe her [Carrie Hughes's] collected letter for their own integrity or the significance they hold for Langston's aesthetic development and output" (xv). While the idea that one's personal interactions with loved ones informs the topics, themes, and/or character development in one's art is well traversed terrain, Williams and Tidwell's application of a psychological theory to Carrie Hughes's letters to her son, along with the suggestion that his response to her can be found in the literature that he wrote is promising.

The editors read Mother Hughes's letters to her son through the Bowen Family Theory (BFT), which suggests that those who do not successfully develop maturity as they should, lean too heavily on those around them. As a result, the authors conclude that because Carrie Hughes is emotionally immature, she consistently neglects her motherly duties to Langston, yet when she does acknowledge him later in his life it is to cast him in the role of provider. He obliges often paying her bills and providing money for food and clothing, too. That selfishness is only one attribute highlighted as her massive maternal

shortcomings becomes clearer and clearer throughout the letters that make up the large majority of the text.

Without a doubt, C. Hughes is a fascinating character. The woman she presents in her letters demonstrate to readers that she, at worst, is a manipulative woman who leeches her son at every turn; or, at best, is a woman who, at times, desperately, tries to fulfill her own artistic aspirations. Through her consistent endeavors at professional acting, it is easy to see that she became a wife and mother when in actuality, she wanted to pursue her own career in the arts. She clings to the “shine” that being the mother of Langston Hughes provides in hopes to share the spotlight—even if only tangentially, and/or from a distance. Reading her letters, along with the background that the editors provide makes it clear that her story might have been strong enough to merit a telling of her own story—without Langston Hughes.

The argument begins to lose cohesion when Williams and Tidwell suggest that, although Hughes failed to openly express feelings about his mother, readers can discover some of his personal thoughts around the subject matter through critical analysis of his female characters. To that end, the editors look for *responses* that he might have made to his mother’s letters through the characters created in *Not Without Laughter*. Although such a reading is possible, it is a weak one—particularly in the absence of L. Hughes’s personal voice about the matter at hand.

How does one strongly show that what Hughes felt about his mother is in fact the whole truth without his letters to her, which would then serve as corroboration to the notions asserted to the reading audience thus far? This is where the most significant critique of the text arises; in spite of the absence of Langston’s voice *at all* in which he articulates his feelings to—and consequently, about—his mother, readers can learn how he felt as we analyze various female characters for their similarities and/or dissimilarities to Carrie Hughes’ accounts. While the BFT helps readers to understand the dynamics at play in terms of Mother Hughes’s relationship to her son, it does not offer a strong way for readers to understand Hughes’s stance when it comes to his mother. Furthermore, *My Dear Boy* fails to show how one might read the effects of the beleaguered mother-son relationship in his published works. It might have been helpful if some of the letters that Hughes wrote to his mother were included in the collection for example. In that instance, the sort of analysis that Williams and Tidwell offer would seem more credible and highlight the complexities of said mother-son relationship.

Why did the editors not think Carrie Hughes was a subject strong enough to stand on her own? This would have made the text far more interesting as it would have allowed readers to delve more deeply into who this woman was. As it stands, the personal letters from mother to son gratify readers’ desires to see another’s private thoughts, and yet, it disappoints by presenting an evidently complex woman in strictly simplistic terms.

Sherry Johnson

Grand Valley State University

GRAPHIC BORDERS: Latino Comic Books, Past, Present & Future. Edited by Frederick Luis Aldama and Christopher González. Austin: University of Texas Press. 2016

Graphic Borders is a welcome collection of essays for anyone interested in the intersection of Latino studies and Popular Culture. Editors Frederick Luis Aldama and Christopher González—who have literally written the book on Latino comics and popular culture—bring together 13 articles and one interview, organized into five cleverly titled sections: “Alternativas”, “Cuerpo Comics”, “Tortilla Strips”, “A Bird, a Plane . . . Straight

and Queer Super Lats”, and “Multiverses, Admixtures, and More”. The result is a collection that is critically astute and timely, and moreover is simply fun to read.

As the title of the text suggests, *Graphic Borders*, is a collection that is critically aware of itself as positioned in a variety of theoretical and practical borders. Titularly drawing on perhaps the most invoked image in Latino studies, the border, the collection plays not only with the meaning of the border in terms of its political and theoretical framing in Latino studies, but it also plays with the border in a broader context, also suggesting the borders created between the interplay of verbal and visual representations, the borders of the space of the page, the borders between mediums (comics, to films, to television), and indeed the borders between different Latino experiences. As the introduction by the editors note:

The thirteen essays and one interview collected in this volume remind us how resplendent and richly various today’s comics are by and about Latinos; they make clear that the culture, history, and experiences of Latinos are varied. They remind us that comics can be just as powerful and sophisticated a storytelling form as the next. They remind us, too, that comics by and about Latinos are made and consumed in time (history) and space (geographic region). (17)

The collection then does work in a variety of registers that are worthy of note. First, it grounds the history of Latino comics by spending the first section “Alternativas” engaged in a critical conversation with the work of Los Bros Hernandez, whose combined creative output has arguably laid the foundation for Latino comics. In the section “Cuerpo Comics” the articles deal in various registers with the racialization of the Latino body in comic books, while section three, “Tortilla Strips” considers the different kind of work that is performed by serialized comic strips, with articles paying specific attention to the *Baldo* and *Ruis* comic strips, as well as the collected works of Lalo Alcaraz. “A Bird, a Plane . . .” considers the presence of queer figures within Latino comics where questions of race, ethnicity, and sexuality intersect. The final section “Multiverses . . .” tackles the place of Latino comics and Latino comic characters within the larger space of the DC and Marvel comic book universes, and pays close attention to the way that Latino characters are consumed (or not) within the space of dominant culture comics.

Taken as a whole, this collection does impressive work, building on our understanding of Latino comics currently and historically. Moreover, it astutely wrestles with questions of what comics do generally and includes considerations of how comics are shaped by popular sentiment and prejudice, market forces, distribution apparatuses, and changing technologies of production. When pairing these questions with how comics are changed when they are taken up by Latino artists, creators, and consumers the result is an intellectually rich and nuanced collection that does not shy away from difficult questions.

Lorna L. Pérez

Buffalo State College

PLAGIARAMA! William Wells Brown and the Aesthetic of Attraction. By Geoffrey Sanborn. New York: Columbia University Press. 2016.

Geoffrey Sanborn’s *Plagiarama! William Wells Brown and the Aesthetic of Attraction* is a valuable addition to American literary criticism. Sanborn introduces William Wells Brown, the author of *Clotel* (1853), the first novel published by an African-American. Sanborn presents Brown as if the text were an autobiography, first as an author, abolitionist, and opponent of Frederick Douglass. Sanborn blends Brown’s authorship and abolition-

ist background seamlessly into a critical narrative of the widespread plagiarism found throughout his work. Sanborn's data collection identifies 87,000 instances of plagiarism in a canon of nearly 300 written works. Sanborn contends that the plagiarism was a clever, intentional, stylistic tool used by an author known for his showmanship to appeal to mass audiences. Beyond plagiarism, Sanborn offers a critical analysis of stylistic choices Brown used both in written text and as a prolific stage performer.

Through a review of selected text, performances, and published reviews, Sanborn is adept in identifying prevailing stylistic choices in many of Brown's most prolific works, including the promulgation of racial stereotypes, suggesting that this brand of minstrelsy allowed mixed audiences to preempt stereotypical jokes, therefore eliminating the uncomfortable ambiguity of a society curious, but not receptive, to directives of equality. In doing so, Brown is said to evoke a shared humanity, described by Sanborn as "the energy of racial stereotypes, the obstacles to an enjoyable interracial sociability, is rerouted into antiracist pleasure (p. 55)". The contrast of this position when compared to the work of Frederick Douglass, whose slave narrative and orations aggressively challenged the status quo, eschewing pleasantries and demanding equality. Sanborn makes mention of these differences in style several times throughout the text without lingering. It is his position that Brown's style goes beyond denouncing slavery and racism, noting "the attractional structure of his work affects those denunciations in ways we have not recognized (p. 80)".

These qualities also extend to the noted fetishism of a beautiful slave girl character, most notably referenced in *Clotel*, whose description of mixed race and pure demeanor can be found throughout Brown's works. While assigning no words or agency to this character, Sanborn describes Brown's description of the woman as many White authors of his time did, focusing on beauty, purity, and silence, rather than on the relationship between a slave/master or concubine/master. It is unclear if the omission of personality is presented to appeal to mass audiences, or if the inclusion of personality would be dangerous and personal, deviating from Brown's style. In all, Sanborn posits that Brown, understanding the need for shared humanity describes Brown's method using beauty as a unifier, having "a capacity to intensify our awareness of the kinds of relationships to the world that the artifice enables us to have." (p. 108) In doing so, Sanborn astutely argues the presence of the beautiful, light skinned slave girl represents the increasing power of white masters who committed rape.

Sanborn adeptly describes the tools and methods used by Brown to evoke emotion and support from widespread audiences. The author compares Brown's style to that of a variety show entertainer "channeling his energies into the production of extra touches, trick and untruth, a surplus of appearance." (p.64) Several comparisons are made between Brown and showman and circus founder P.T. Barnum. Sanborn capitalizes on this theatrical style to present Brown's works and the reception of his audience. This allows the reader to engage as if the information itself is a performance piece. In doing so, the reader is invited to question Brown's ability to remove himself from the stories he shared with abolitionist audiences. Sanborn finds the technique of lifting passages a careful decision to capture hearts and minds through vivid storytelling. Perhaps the greatest strength of the book is Sanborn's ability to weave in Brown's usage of related works both in the written word and performance art, much in the way that Brown himself may have intended. Sanborn portrays Brown as a complex character who artfully constructs entertainment from the voices of others to deliver an abolitionist message. The book is thoughtful, artistic in its layout and critique, and is an important addition to a much-overlooked aspect of American literary history.

Cecelia Parnter

Western Michigan University

FISH STICKS, SPORTS BRAS, AND ALUMINUM CANS: The Politics of Everyday Technologies. By Paul R. Josephson. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 2015.

Paul R. Josephson's *Fish Sticks, Sports Bras, and Aluminum Cans* is intended to be "engaging and readable," not "deeply theoretical" (4), enabling it to serve as "a textbook for a high school or college course" concerned about "the place of technology in the modern world" (5). His central argument is that "we cannot look at objects in isolation, but must consider the messy interaction of engineering, scientific, financial, governmental, consumer, and social institutions in giving impetus—or creating obstacles—to the dissemination of technology, and [that] we must recognize all of the actors involved in their history" (4). The first part of the claim would be banal if not for the kind of audience imagined for the book, which may include many readers who need gentle guidance to see how objects they use in their daily lives do not arise *ex nihilo* but instead are products of "technological systems . . . consisting of physical components (artifacts), natural resources, and organizations (manufacturing firms, utility companies, investment banks, scientific and engineering research organizations, and universities) that interact with other artifacts" (3). The second part of the claim would, if taken literally, establish from the outset the impossibility of Josephson's project, for no analysis could possibly "recognize all of the actors involved" in inventing, improving, producing, financing, regulating, transporting, marketing, selling, consuming, recycling, or discarding any commonplace object.

Consequently, the merit of Josephson's book derives not from his overarching argument but from the particular patterns and idiosyncratic details that emerge from rich case studies assembled from wide-ranging primary and secondary sources, which include corporate archives and websites, government reports, industry and trade publications, patent applications, personal interviews, popular magazines and newspapers, and scholarly books and articles. Using these materials, Josephson traces the complicated histories of such quotidian objects as the fish stick, the sports bra, the banana, the aluminum can, the potato, and high fructose corn syrup. In their best moments, these histories reveal the confluence of unforeseen circumstances and flashes of serendipity, such as the curious way by which the fish stick, "the ocean's hot dog" (6), came into existence, "less [in response to] consumer demand and more in response to overproduction based on new fishing and refrigeration technologies, including sonar that enabled locating schools of fish, advances in materials science that led to light, strong, and very large nets that allowed for bigger catches, a weak fish market" (6), and shifts in attitudes about food preparation that, at the level of the household, valued the convenience of heat-and-eat frozen meals and that, at the institutional-level, emphasized the efficiency of portion control (20-21).

It should be noted, however, that Josephson sometimes loses himself—and certainly his readers—in minutiae that should have been relegated to endnotes if included at all. After all, some details that would certainly have been relevant for actors involved in the history of these objects are not equally relevant for his targeted audience of high school students, college students, and—according to the back cover—general readers. For example, in Chapter 2, do such readers really need to know about a particular 2012 study that found that the "mean bilateral vertical component of the bra-breast force in standing was 11.7 ± 4.6 N, whereas during treadmill running the mean unilateral bra-breast force ranged from 8.7 ± 6.4 N to 14.7 ± 10.3 N in the high and low support conditions, respectively," with N standing for a Newton, the unit that measures "the amount of net force required to accelerate a mass of one kilogram at a rate of one meter per second squared" (45)? Or, in Chapter 6, what is added to the reader's understanding of "the role of big technology under Stalin and Putin" in Soviet and Russian history by mentioning that the Bilibino

Station in Chukotka “consists of four graphite-moderated EPG-6 reactors, related to the RMBK design, each producing 12 MW electric and 62 MW thermal power (heat) that provides 80 percent of the region’s electricity” (149)?

Chapter 5, which questions the very idea of “the natural disaster,” proves to be the most interesting and timely section of the book (especially in the aftermath of Hurricanes Harvey and Irma). Josephson asserts that the label “natural disaster” is a misnomer because every disaster—from wildfires burning in southern California to tsunamis striking the coast of Japan—is “something complex that involve[s] humans, their technological systems and nature. . . . Natural disasters involve human presence—villages, homes, cemeteries, businesses, factories, schools, and hospitals, which are often situated in floodplains or on the coast . . . because of such perverse incentives as federally subsidized insurance” (8), which encourages property owners to build in riskier areas than they otherwise would if they had to pay actual market rates for flood insurance, and federally subsidized civil engineering projects, which have huge costs, spotty success records, and a tendency to do a much better job of protecting the interests of businesses and the wealthy than those of the less-privileged (whose communities may be sacrificed to floodwaters in order to reduce pressure on levees near collapse). Unfortunately, Josephson’s legitimate argument is undermined by his utter lack of seriousness in proposing a solution for the problems he identifies; for example, instead of acknowledging the massive displacements that would occur if all major urban centers and other communities currently in floodplains or along coasts were to be relocated or abandoned, he muses, clearly in a throwaway remark, that “[p]erhaps we should build only three things in flood plains: golf courses, cemeteries, and shopping malls. Golf courses will dry out and may even be swept clean. Cemeteries are underground, and their occupants do not vote. And the loss of millions of dollars of needless consumer goods should be a source of joy, not of sorrow, except for insurance companies” (116).

Josephson concludes his book with a call for a “thoughtful personal resistance” to the purchase and use of products that emerge from and depend upon ethically and environmentally dubious technological systems that exploit workers, shift wealth into the hands of multinational corporations, damage ecosystems, and/or harm the health of consumers. We need, in short, to “learn how to live without many of these objects, or at least put them aside from time to time, no matter how advertisers and industrial psychologists try to convince us of their indispensability” (176). But the imagined resister sounds more like a picnicker taking a day off from work than a committed political activist when, in the final sentence of the book, Josephson innocuously admonishes readers to “[b]uy a baguette, grab a book and a blanket, get on your bicycle, go to a park, and wrap yourself around both of them—the book and the blanket” (176). Fortunately for Josephson, the value of *Fish Sticks, Sports Bras, and Aluminum Cans* does not depend upon where it begins and where it ends, but upon the noteworthy case studies that appear in between.

Kevin J. Porter

University of Texas at Arlington

TERRORIZING LATINA/O IMMIGRANTS: Race, Gender, And Immigration Politics in The Age of Security. By Anna Sampaio. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. 2015.

Anna Sampaio’s *Terrorizing Latina/o Immigrants: Race, Gender, And Immigration Politics in the Age of Security* provides a comprehensive and engaging analysis of how Latina/o immigrants exist in a paradox: in that, they are portrayed as terrorists by a nation that in fact terrorizes them.

While steeped in contemporary concerns about the enforcement policies of such agencies as the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and the Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS), the book effectively links these phenomena with the nation's history of dealing with Latina/o persons, beginning with the Guadalupe Hidalgo Treaty, which created the U.S.-Mexico border we know today, up until the DREAM Act. In the process, Sampaio successfully links the experiences of immigrants with the plight of other immigrant groups that endured exclusionary legislation fueled by racism, such as the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act and the Immigration Act of 1917. Thus, while the book is primarily concerned with the issues faced by Latina/o communities, its conscious efforts to link these issues with those endured by other communities will fascinate students and scholars of ethnic American history, culture, literature, and film.

Sampaio also successfully shows how race and gender intersect in the persecution—or, to paraphrase her title, the *terrorizing*—of Latina/o communities. This is especially evident in the second chapter, in which Sampaio argues that the nation's security discourses rely on rhetoric of “masculine protectionism, demonization, and de-Americanization in ways that constitute Latina/o immigrants as foreign and threatening, positioning them as potential terrorists” (21). In other words, the United States positions itself as the masculinized protector, thus relegating its own citizens (as well as women and children abroad) as feminized dependents, while demonizing and de-Americanizing Latina/o immigrants. The author's analysis of the intersectionality of race and gender continues in chapter 6 through its three case studies of Jose Padilla, Yaser Hamdi, and John Walker Lindh. In one of its most compelling arguments about how racism operates in the treatment of individuals accused of treason, she points out that of the three individuals examined here, Lindh in fact was the only one “who admitted to working on behalf of the Taliban [and] to fighting against the United States” (127), yet “retained the rights of political agency of a citizen” (113) due to his status as a white, middle-class man. The author uses critical race studies, feminist theory, and intersectional analysis to complement her background in political science, thus differentiating her work from preexisting scholarship, which Sampaio writes “leaves unexamined the way that racialization and gendering processes have operated in tandem to construct Latina/o immigrants as potential terrorists and to legitimize their terrorization via restrictive state practices” (8).

In addition to these methodologies, Sampaio also uses newspaper articles in her study. While some may criticize her reliance on newspapers, the author strategically explains that her use of such sources stems from the lack of documentation by the DHS, ICE, and the CIS. By drawing our attention specifically to this lack of documentation from government agencies, Sampaio highlights the dangers of the restrictive legislation and practices of the U.S. and state governments towards Latina/o populations, including natural born citizens as Sampaio shows in chapter 6. For students and scholars seeking a carefully-researched and nuanced study on the issues facing Latina/o immigrants, Sampaio's book is worthwhile reading.

Francisco Delgado

University of New Haven

CITY OF INMATES: Conquest, Rebellion, and the Rise of Human Caging in Los Angeles, 1771–1965. By Kelly Lytle Hernandez. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 2017.

Lytle Hernandez's *Cities of Inmates: Conquest, Rebellion, and the Rise of Human Caging in Los Angeles* is a study of the rise of imprisonment, broadly speaking, and the

buildup of Los Angeles's prison system, which by 1950 was the largest of any US city. The book makes significant contributions to US history, urban history, the study of race and ethnicity, and carceral history. Incarceration is foundational to Los Angeles; the city was literally built by convict labor, which was perfectly legal under the Thirteenth Amendment's dual provisions of ending black slavery while allowing the use of unfree labor as criminal punishment. As a scholar exploring race as a relational concept, I am fascinated by Lytle Hernandez's account of how the history of incarceration affected racialized groups differently over time—and how the development of Los Angeles remains, in the aggregate, a story about power, domination, and race.

Each chapter unfolds a story that explains how the carceral complex in Los Angeles expanded and shape-shifted in order to control whichever population had resources of labor or land that were needed at the time. The book spans three centuries, examining the workings of imprisonment at different historical moments, including Native American imprisonment beginning in the 1700s, immigrant detention of Chinese and moral panics over homeless white men in the late 1800s, the first cases of Mexican imprisonment and their connection to the Mexican Revolution, the growth and entrenchment of Mexican incarceration in the 1920s and 30s, and its overlap with the origins of black incarceration in the city. Starting with the first prison established during the founding of Los Angeles, and connecting the histories and experiences of racialized groups not traditionally examined together (including Native Americans, Chinese, Mexicans, blacks, and poor whites), Lytle Hernandez deftly demonstrates that imprisonment is much more than punishment—it is also a way of subjugating, plundering, and even disappearing groups not part of the settler colonial ruling class. Scholars have traditionally studied these histories separately, grouping them by time period, by distinct racial and ethnic groups, or by forms of imprisonment (convict leasing, immigrant detention). Lytle Hernandez's interdisciplinary approach, however, makes a compelling argument that they should be examined together, as all fall within the rubric she terms "caging" and the long history of white settler colonialism.

Reading this book at times felt like stepping through the looking glass. Through her painstaking research and capacious theoretical framework, Lytle Hernandez has an uncanny ability to take what we think we know and turn it on its head. The story of Los Angeles, for instance, is commonly told as one of four distinct time periods with little connection made between them: indigenous society, Spanish conquest, the Mexican period, and the US conquest in 1848. Using her carceral lens, Lytle Hernandez fills in those gaps, demonstrating how legal systems in one period were transferred to the next in ways that kept the racial hierarchy of the region intact. For example, the use of public order charges (e.g. vagrancy laws) during the Mexican period (1810–21) solidified the control and racialization of the indigenous population that begun decades earlier, while expanding that control to include Africans, mulattos, and mesitzos. As these populations were racialized and marked as unworthy of citizenship, the category of "criminal" was neatly mapped onto the racial categories of the time. Under American rule, these same vagrancy laws increasingly justified a captive native population who could be auctioned to the highest bidder or used for work on a chain gang. That this all occurred in California, a supposedly free state, is staggering. By connecting the time periods, a unique move, Lytle Hernandez uses a wide lens to demonstrate how the creation and enforcement of laws through policing and imprisonment was central not just for the policing of racialized and landless groups, but also for the structuring of social hierarchies. Her work shows that the study of a society is incomplete without this history.

Natalia Molina

University of California, San Diego

RACE AND RETAIL: Consumption Across The Color Line. Edited by Mia Bay and Ann Fabian. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 2015.

Over recent years, the phrase “shopping while black” has entered common parlance to describe the experience of being denied service, being given poor service, or being racially profiled in a retail setting. Indeed, the prevalence of misplaced accusations of theft by department store officials against black customers prompted a number of prominent retailers such as Bloomingdale’s and Macy’s to introduce a “Customer Bill of Rights” in 2013. The Bill outlined a commitment to “ensuring that all shoppers, guests, and employees are treated with respect and dignity and are free from unreasonable searches, profiling, and discrimination of any kind in our store.” While this initiative has been dismissed by detractors as a marketing ploy that merely pays lip service to racial equality, its introduction is a reminder that ongoing retail discrimination against people of color “has deep roots in the social and economic divisions that structure American society” (2).

It is these roots which Mia Bay and Ann Fabian seek to examine in this welcome addition to the rapidly expanding literature on race, consumer activism, and the retail sector. Bay, a Professor of History and Director of the Center for Race and Ethnicity at Rutgers, and Fabian, a Professor Emeritus of History and American Studies at the same institution, have assembled a diverse cast of contributors whose work reaffirms the historical significance and continuing salience of race and ethnicity in shaping everyday shopping experiences and interactions. Given the scope and complexity of the subject at hand, it is unsurprising that this collection stretches across a number of geographical, chronological and disciplinary boundaries. To help organize the work, its editors have divided the book into three broad sections: “Race, Place and Retail Spaces”, “Race, Retail and Communities”, and “The Inner Landscapes of Racialized Consumption.”

The first of these sections, “Race, Place and Retail Spaces”, provides a selection of historically focused case studies which range from urban centers in the northern “ghetto belt” and the Mexican borderlands in the South to retail spaces in South Africa. Mia Bay, Naa Oyo Kwate and Traci Parker’s essays provide new insights into the well-trodden terrain of African American retail activism, while Geraldo Cadava and Bridget Kenny offer a transnational perspective on the complex intersections of labor, consumption, and ethnic market segmentation. Part II, “Race, Retail and Communities,” explores the impact of race and ethnicity in configuring the marketplace experiences of particular communities. Perhaps the most valuable contribution is John W. Heaton’s essay on subsistence shopping in Interior Alaska, which pushes back against scholarship focusing on native appropriation and resource loss to argue that market engagement helped Alaskan Athabascans “preserve rather than destroy their distinct cultural identity” (124). Ellen Wu’s chapter also makes a strong case for how the commercialization of Chinatown played a critical role in the “extraordinary racial makeover” of Asian Americans from insidious Orientals to a “model minority” (141). The final part of the book, cryptically titled “The Inner Landscapes of Racialized Consumption”, appears to contain contributions which did not fit neatly into the first two sections. This is not necessarily a criticism, as there are a number of valuable essays to be found here, ranging from Melissa Cooper’s discussion of “selling voodoo” in American cities during the early twentieth century, to more theoretical discussions into the relationship between retail access and public health.

While readers will be able to find weaknesses in this collection, it would be unfair to apportion much blame for this to the book’s editors. Indeed, one would be hard-pressed to find a more accomplished duo than Bay and Fabian to pilot this project. Instead, they speak to the size and scope of their efforts to document the “myriad intersections between

race and retail and open up still more avenues for investigation" (10). As with all edited collections, the individual essays here vary in quality with regards to argument, archival engagement and originality. However, when taken as a whole, they present a rich and intellectually stimulating introduction to an expanding body of scholarly work on retail activism, civil rights, mass consumption and racial identity.

E. James West

University of Birmingham, UK

BLACK MOSAIC: The Politics of Black Pan-Ethnic Diversity. By Candis Watts Smith. New York: New York University Press. 2014.

The 2010 United States Census featured the racial category of "Black or African American" and talk of the "Black vote" is a regular feature of American election coverage. Like any socially constructed, instrumental racial category, "Black" has its limitations as globalization and migration flows from Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean continue to complicate what "Blackness" means in the United States. Political scientist Candis Watts Smith's *Black Mosaic* takes on the necessary and considerable task of examining the nuances within this sweeping racial category by posing these core questions:

"Considering the fact that ethnicity continues to be a salient identity within a racialized context, how do African Americans and Black immigrants conceptualize who is Black? Do Black Immigrants embrace or reject a Black racial identity that is inclusive of Blacks native to the U.S.? Similarly, do African Americans embrace an identity that is inclusive of Black immigrants? Do Black immigrants share a sense of group consciousness similar to what has long been documented for African Americans? To what extent are the political and policy attitudes of Black immigrants and African Americans similar or different? Finally, what are the prospects for intraracial coalitions of African American and Black immigrants across the country (Smith, 3)?"

After a considerable survey of existing literature exploring differences between Black groups, Smith utilizes results from the National Survey of American Life (2001-2003) and dozens of poignant interviews with subjects with backgrounds that span the full spectrum of recent immigrant, 2nd generation, racially mixed, and African American experiences. The combination of data analysis and ethnography is effective at showing how large trends play out at the individual level. Non-specialists might have some trouble with the more specific political science jargon featured in the discussion of the data sections, but the ethnography portions are universally accessible and revealing. The context provided in the author's interviews with subjects from diverse backgrounds alone make this a valuable contribution to a few academic fields.

As a historian, I would only contend that we should consider the major role geopolitical events such as the 1935 Italian invasion of Ethiopia, onset of African independence movements, and the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa have played in inspiring Smith's framework of "diasporic consciousness" throughout American history. The author makes important distinctions between traditional notions of pan-Africanism and "diasporic consciousness," but there is certainly important overlap between each concept.

Overall, *Black Mosaic* represents an important contribution and necessary shift in political science, American, African American, and Black studies. It goes beyond the sweeping and all too often naturalized category of "Black" presented in the U.S. Census,

to give readers a much more sophisticated understanding of the evolving face of American “Blackness,” the key differences within it and the forces that compel group consciousness/action. I await with anticipation academic studies of these dynamics as they relate to an increasingly global Black Lives Matter movement.

Justin Williams

City College of New York

ATOMICS IN THE CLASSROOM: Teaching the Bomb in the Early Postwar Era. By Michael Scheibach. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company. 2015.

Books on American culture during the early Cold War are numerous, but one sorely neglected aspect of this culture was the integration of nuclear issues into the curricula of American schools. There has been significant scholarship on the teaching of Civil Defense concepts in schools, but these have largely failed to place those teaching modules into the larger context of postwar education. Michael Scheibach’s book takes a more holistic look at “atomics” in American schools during the early postwar period, from 1945 to the early 1960s. Scheibach’s book is rich in source material and each chapter includes a primary document in its entirety at the end of the chapter. Scheibach makes abundantly clear that the advent of nuclear weapons and the threat of nuclear warfare posed a crisis for American educators, and that their collective response was a broad integration of scientific data, emotional management and civics indoctrination aimed not just at preparing students for life in the atomic age, but to hold “democracy” together in the face of seemingly foundational threats.

The book is divided into five chapters. The first four track specific topics woven into American public school curricula and the fifth tracks those topics from the early 1950s into the New Frontier of the Kennedy years, when the nuclear threat was transforming from its early Cold War iteration into the much more existential threat of the latter Cold War. The first chapter examines models of political survival educators presented to students immediately after Hiroshima and Nagasaki. These were presented in two iterations, the first of One World government, and these second as the safeguarding of democracy through the retention of national sovereignty and cooperation via the United Nations. Scheibach examines how the focus shifted from the first model to the second as the Cold War intensified in the late 1940s. The second chapter outlines the process by which “atomics,” the teaching of basics about atomic energy, nuclear physics and astrophysics, became strongly emphasized in the curriculum. Chapter three covers the familiar territory of the teaching of Civil Defense concepts for “fear management and panic prevention” (p. 14). Chapter 4 explores the training of students in democratic citizenship to prepare them to support civilization and insure the ongoing survival of Western style democracy. The final chapter tracks these themes into the era of intercontinental missile technology and the threat of global thermonuclear war and omnicide.

While Scheibach’s book examines the place of “atomics” in the classroom during the early Cold War, the book itself is especially useful in college classrooms today where there is widespread teaching on American culture in the “Homefront” during the Cold War. The book does not engage in extensive historiographic debates, but rather substantiates an essential aspect of early Cold War American culture. However, Scheibach makes clear, as previous authors have not, that the impact of nuclear weapons and the threats of the Cold War extended much deeper into American pedagogy than simply the theatricality of Civil Defense training, and shaped the course of postwar American education in diverse and profound ways.

Robert A. Jacobs

Hiroshima Peace Institute/Hiroshima City University, Japan