

Book Reviews

Ruben Flores. *Backroads Pragmatists: Mexico's Melting Pot and Civil Rights in the United States*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014. 360 pp. Cloth \$45.00.

The concept of the nation is highly influential in shaping the scope of historical studies and the questions they ask, often in unseen and uncritical ways. Ruben Flores's *Backroads Pragmatists: Mexico's Melting Pot and Civil Rights in the United States* upends self-limiting nationalistic perspectives to uncover the hidden connections of people and ideas in major social movements in the United States and in Mexico between 1920 and 1950. More specifically, *Backroads Pragmatists* is an original and transgressive book that analyzes how "Mexico's postrevolutionary melting pot shaped the American civil rights movement" (p. 12). Flores's lengthy study is the first book-length exploration of this hidden universe of intriguing connections and how they profoundly shaped what are commonly held as unconnected topics in separate historiographies. The author interrogates the intellectual contributions and policy impact of several key thinkers who were in constant contact and dialogue with one another across physical and cultural borders.

Flores, an Associate Professor of American Studies at the University of Kansas, begins with a compelling analysis of Mexico's rural school system and teacher-training institutions and how they reflected the nation's revolutionary ethos. He then shifts to scholars in the United States whose domestic research and activism on civil rights for African Americans and Mexican Americans was intimately connected to their work on education and ideas of acculturation from Mexico. *Backroads Pragmatists* is a stimulating intellectual history filled with examinations of Mexican intellectuals such as José Vasconcelos, Moisés Sáenz Garza, Manuel Gamio, and Rafael Ramirez, as well as American scholars such as Lloyd Tireman, George I. Sánchez, Marie Hughes, Montana Hastings, and Ralph Beals. All these figures, as Flores documents, were connected to the philosophical tenets of pragmatism and John Dewey's crucial role in it. The author smartly discusses how Mexican thinkers had engaged Deweyan philosophy more seriously and with more policy impact than U.S. scholars. This book is patient and highly attentive to language. A close reading of Mexican sources, for example, captures the intriguing metaphorical distinctions in discussions of Mexican national identity and culture. The author takes U.S. scholars to task for focusing on biology to explain the term *mestizaje* (racial mixing) while ignoring its wider cultural meaning as it emanated from the Mexican Revolution. Flores also corrects U.S. scholars who have rushed to

simplistically pigeonhole Mexico's *indigenismo* movement as solely an exotic and damaging perspective that rendered Native American people invisible through melting pot, assimilationist rhetoric. He counters that this one-sided judgment has obstructed the ability of scholars to recognize this movement's "liberationist possibilities" in attacking long-standing injustices (p. 88).

Backroads Pragmatists is a careful, nuanced study. It sensitively analyzes differences among seemingly like-minded academic activists. The tension between Lloyd Tireman and George I. Sánchez of the United States over the role of language segregation in Mexican-American civil rights cases, for example, was based on Tireman's more engaged and totalistic subscription to Deweyan philosophy. This tension establishes the limits of Deweyan theory in the battle against Jim Crow. Sánchez, a less philosophically dogmatic and more politically aware thinker, on the other hand, came to view language in the early grades almost entirely as a legal justification for what was in effect the de facto racial segregation of Mexicans and Mexican Americans. Likewise, Sánchez's uncritical exuberance in defending the Mexican state is instructively contrasted with Marie Hughes's cautious emphasis upon the permanence of Mexican immigration to the United States and how it belied the Mexican state's triumphalist claims of reform and prosperity. And Flores demonstrates how these activists and scholars changed over time. For example, Edwin Embree, the well-known Chicago-based civil rights pioneer for African-American education in the U.S. South, had been intimately connected to the Mexican school movement since the 1930s. However, his attitude toward it by the 1940s had evolved significantly. Several years after Embree had first "suggested Rosenwald assistance to Mexico's federal state," he reversed "his position toward the Secretaría de Educación Pública from patron to beneficiary as a result of the increasing difficulties that Rosenwald programs were experiencing in the American South" (p. 153).

The intellectual and policy interconnections unearthed in *Backroads Pragmatists* are fascinating. The author's discovery of Montana Hastings, for example, is an incredible find. Hastings, nearly unknown to U.S. historians, was an early twentieth-century social psychologist who, after a decades-long teaching and administrative career in Missouri and New Mexico, left the United States to work for the Mexican government during the 1920s and 1930s. Responsible for administering thousands of IQ exams, Hastings published "the first large-scale investigation of the mental capacities of Mexico's schoolchildren in the aftermath of the Mexican Revolution," an enduring legacy of pragmatism at work in hammering out the practicalities of Mexico's melting pot rhetoric for its public schools (p. 103). Though Flores is far too enthusiastic over the degree to which George I. Sánchez's Rosenwald

schools, Tireman's New Mexico schools, and the *Mendez* (1947) and *Delgado* (1948) court victories actually transformed U.S. education, particularly with regard to the widespread and intensifying segregation of Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans during this time period, the international connections he establishes are very intriguing. Flores demonstrates that in the United States "desegregation campaigns occurred in the context of international integration movements that transcended domestic projects in racial liberalism at home" (p. 216). This is the all-important and compelling takeaway of *Backroads Pragmatists*.

In *Backroads Pragmatists: Mexico's Melting Pot and Civil Rights in the United States*, Professor Ruben Flores masterfully explores a different and needed kind of transnational intellectual history. In doing so, he casts a new and revealing light over what many historians have known solely as national stories. In fact, they are truly international stories. This is a splendid book that offers historians of Mexico and the United States, as well as all education scholars, new and generative ways to think about the transnational influences upon their national histories.

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

CARLOS KEVIN BLANTON

Natalia Mehlman Petrzela. *Classroom Wars: Language, Sex, and the Making of Modern Political Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015. 336 pp. Hardcover \$35.00.

The historiographical intersection of education and politics in the 1970s has long been jammed with yellow school buses—a reflection of Richard Nixon's observation in December 1971 that court-ordered busing to promote school integration was "by far" the nation's "hottest" domestic issue. Those school buses, in turn, did more than shuttle students from segregated neighborhoods to integrated schools amidst howls of protest. They also helped drive the nation's political center of gravity rightward. In particular, they delivered working-class whites, battered by the decade's dismal deindustrializing economy, away from the party of Roosevelt and Johnson and into the party of Nixon and Reagan.

Into the desegregation-focused scholarship on education and politics in the 1970s, Natalia Mehlman Petrzela's *Classroom Wars: Language, Sex, and the Making of Modern Political Culture* brings bilingual education and sex education as they were conceptualized and contested

in California's public schools beginning in the mid-1960s and, ultimately, contributed to the state's passage of Proposition 13 and the nation's turn toward conservatism by the late 1970s. Admirably and provocatively, Petrzela draws multiple connections between subjects often treated separately: between bilingual education and sex education; between bilingual education, sex education, *and* the property tax revolt that began in California and swept through the nation; between cultural politics in the classroom and fiscal politics over school funding; and between educational history/historiography and political history/historiography.

On the face of it, bilingual education and sex education are hardly a natural pairing. Indeed, the impetus for each sprung from very different sources: Spanish- and Chinese-speaking immigrants in cities, on the one hand, and middle-class whites in suburbs, on the other. The initial attempts to establish bilingual education and sex education programs went off without a hitch. Bilingual education, in its early incarnations, even had strong bipartisan support. "The multiple, and often unexpected, origins of bilingual-bicultural policy and practice in California and the nation at large" (p. 38), for example, included prominent Republicans—from California governor Ronald Reagan and archconservative Superintendent of Public Instruction Max Rafferty to President Richard Nixon, who buttressed the Bilingual Education Act signed into law by his predecessor in 1968.

Opposition to both bilingual education and sex education, however, soon mounted. Chicano student protests that began in East Los Angeles in the late 1960s and spread across the state and nation by the early 1970s called for greater "cultural affirmation," which included bilingual education along with Chicano Studies taught by Chicano teachers, among other demands (p. 41). Bilingual education thus became linked with "Latino self-determination" (p. 50) and other "radical causes," including civil rights and opposition to the Vietnam War (p. 56). As it did, the "early consensus over bilingual education" crumbled (p. 41). Rafferty, for example, who had "pioneered" the state's "openly pluralistic bilingual education policy in the mid-1960s" (p. 40), now recoiled at the "identity politics" with which it had become associated. Some prominent Mexican Americans, including Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction Eugene Gonzales, joined him as well, reflecting "rifts" and ideological "variegation" among California Latinos (pp. 40, 63).

Meanwhile, the "expanded sexual discourse in schools" (p. 107)—which included frank conversations about masturbation, homosexuality, and "pleasure over procreation" between partners who did not necessarily need to be married (p. 109)—sparked a "conservative backlash" (p. 115). Sex education, its opponents argued, undermined parental

authority and rights—foreshadowing the emergence of the “family values’ wing of the new Right” (p. 157)—while overburdening “increasingly strapped taxpayers” who footed the bill for inept and immoral sex educators, one of whom bore the inimitable name Candy Love (pp. 118, 122).

In the crucible of opposition to bilingual education and sex education, the union between the two policies was forged—at least in the minds of their critics who “marr[ied] concerns about sexuality and language” (p. 3). To their detractors, bilingual education and sex education reflected “an embrace of ‘difference’—moral, linguistic, or ethnic—[that] appeared pernicious to the American polity” (p. 174) and contributed to the “erosion of the American family and culture” (p. 5).

These concerns, in turn, fueled the antitax fire that culminated in California’s Proposition 13 in 1978. Given the tight coupling between property taxes and school finance, it is not surprising that Proposition 13 had a devastating impact on the state’s K–12 schools. This, Petrzela observes, has been the focus of much of the extensive scholarly treatment of California’s (in)famous property tax cutting measure. Yet, as Petrzela maintains, Proposition 13 had educational *causes* as well as consequences. It was, she writes, “Driven in important ways by a profound skepticism about educational programs perceived to be aligned with an immoral, antipatriotic, and fiscally improvident counterculture,” including bilingual education and sex education (p. 213).

By linking bilingual education and sex education to Proposition 13, Petrzela moves beyond the usual educational suspect—busing—invoked in the substantial historiography on the rise of conservatism. At the same time, however, she documents a post–Proposition 13 persistence of bilingual education and sex education. This, she argues, echoing the likes of Jonathan Zimmerman on multiculturalism (*Whose America?*, 2002), John David Skrentny on the “minority rights revolution” (*Minority Rights Revolution*, 2002), and Jonathan Bell on California politics (*California Crucible*, 2010), reveals “the limitations of the rightward turn in American political culture” (p. 133). Backlash, in other words, did not mean about-face. Instead, bilingual education and sex education continued to be taught throughout the 1970s and beyond. Moreover, they contributed to—and became subsumed by—multiculturalism, which also persisted in the Reagan era and beyond. Indeed, it was the “persistent power of progressivism in the K–12 schoolhouse and society” (p. 184) that helps explain the contemporaneous deep-seated “passions of conservative cultural warriors such as Buchanan, Cheney, and Rush Limbaugh” (p. 215).

Given the centrality of Proposition 13 to the “modern political culture” that is the big game that *Classroom Wars* is ultimately hunting

(at least judging from the book's subtitle), and given the connection Petrzela posits between bilingual education and sex education, on the one hand, and Proposition 13, on the other hand, one wonders why Petrzela relegates Proposition 13 to her book's Conclusion. Absent a more systematic inquiry into the causes of Proposition 13, *Classroom Wars* does not cinch the connection between bilingual education/sex education and Proposition 13 with the same power and persuasiveness it does for the other provocative and important connections it draws, including, most notably, between bilingual education and sex education. It also raises critical questions that a more thorough investigation of the causes of Proposition 13 might have answered: If bilingual education and sex education contributed to Proposition 13, why did they persist afterward, especially given the otherwise harsh impact Proposition 13 had on so many other facets of California K–12 education? If they were causes, why were they not casualties? More generally, how do bilingual education and sex education stack up against other explanations advanced for Proposition 13's passage? These include, most notably, Isaac Martin's *The Permanent Tax Revolt* (2008) emphasis on property tax assessment modernization and the attendant loss of long-held tax privileges by homeowners, and Peter Schrag's *Paradise Lost* (1998) emphasis on *Serrano v. Priest*, California's historic school finance reform decision, and the legislation that implemented it during the 1970s. If *Classroom Wars* does not answer these questions, it at least raises them, which is a testament to its power to provoke.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

MARK BRILLIANT

Gabriel N. Rosenberg. *The 4-H Harvest: Sexuality and the State in Rural America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016. 304 pp. Hardcover \$55.00.

By replacing the schoolhouse with a clover, Gabriel N. Rosenberg suggests a new focus for rural education's histories: 4-H clubs. *The 4-H Harvest: Sexuality and the State in Rural America* spans over seventy-five years, covering the domestic and global spread of 4-H youth clubs that attempted to transform the family and cultivate "authentic American identity" (p. 121). Those unfamiliar with these youth voluntary associations will find adequate introduction in the opening pages and will be reminded that 4-H clubs "were predominantly rural and focused on agriculture and home economics" (p. 2). Rosenberg successfully merges research interests in queer theory and biopolitical theory with careful

historical inquiry in modern U.S. history, gender studies, and childhood studies to produce an ambitious interdisciplinary text.

While all six chapters (excluding the Introduction and Epilogue) can stand alone, together they cohere chronologically and thematically as Rosenberg weaves three parallel narratives: an institutional history of 4-H, a cultural interpretation of the history of the political economy of U.S. agriculture, and a Foucauldian history of 4-H as a biopolitical apparatus, especially as it impacts the bodies of rural youth and families. According to Rosenberg, this book holds relevance—to name a few—for those who study agricultural history; histories of sexuality, gender, and the body; queer political history; and global food systems. Rosenberg does not cast his text in the role of education history. However, central to his project is the education of the public.

The 4-H Harvest should be understood as education history not only because it provides an institutional history of an extracurricular association, but also because Rosenberg explores rural youth programs that utilize youth bodies as instruments of state aims. This analysis strengthens existing understanding of how and what lessons children learned from institutional sources outside of schools. Along the way, the history of common schools, reformer L. H. Bailey, and the Smith-Lever Act for federal extension provide familiar touchstones for historians of education. Still, Rosenberg's history moves beyond public schools as sites of public education. Between the lines, he asks readers to consider rural youth as teachers and learners in a dynamic process of public education. 4-H clubs "transformed rural children into extensions of the USDA and made any adult who assisted them the same" (p. 43). Moreover, 4-H meetings had syllabi, complex systems of guest speakers, and lessons for the public to learn. Following Rosenberg's footnotes reveals only a limited collection of sources commonly cited by historians of rural education. Wayne Fuller's *The Old Country School* (1985) is the most prominent, and Tracy Steffes's article on the "Rural School Problem" (2008) is among the most recent. Though important, these are not the sources that stand out—Rosenberg's analysis of photographs, congressional records, agricultural geography, fiction, rural sociology, correspondence, and National Archives records is wide-ranging and noteworthy. His methods demonstrate an alternative approach to education history that yielded a new history of teaching and learning. His work did not begin in search of education history, but this is among his ends.

Rosenberg argues throughout *The 4-H Harvest* that the ideology of "agrarian futurism" is the mechanism that propels the 4-H curriculum. According to Rosenberg, agrarian futurism "privileges tropes, technologies, and knowledge derived from plant and animal agriculture" and "links the intensive governance of the present in an aspirational

vision of the future” (p. 12). This argument is a departure from previously held notions that agricultural life was exclusively a land for luddites. Though aspects of agrarian futurism may be gleaned by reading individual chapters, Rosenberg’s examination of agrarian futurism is his best display of argumentation developed throughout the text.

The three central chapters (chapters 2–4) make up Rosenberg’s key analysis of the bodies of rural youth and families, and together they stand out as a unique analysis of childhood, gender, and education. With few exceptions, clubs were separated by sex. Boys were taught about good character and capital, whereas girls clubs focused on “cultivating beauty, health, and careful consumption” (p. 89). Eventually, the goals of 4-H programs turned boys and girls into productive farm businessmen and homemakers. Not unlike animals kept on the farm, health scorecards were used to evaluate boys and girls aiming for bodily perfection. By penetrating the rural home through instruction of rural youth, Rosenberg argues, 4-H works to publicly “normalize the ideal of white, middle-class rural heterosexuality” (p. 126). The 4-H enterprise was not one of inclusion; it worked carefully through rural youth (and the adults connected to them) in increasing numbers to popularize a particular way of life exclusive by race, class, gender, and sexuality.

This use of 4-H programs to promote both political programs and agendas was typical, and in his last two chapters Rosenberg highlights the parallel inequalities of African-American 4-H groups in the United States and global 4-H extension clubs during the Cold War. Nationally 4-H was known by the 1940s to tout humanistic goals, but as Rosenberg explores through analysis of citizenship, for segregated black clubs this did not match experience. Rosenberg is alert to include racism, which provides contradicting interpretations of national 4-H identity. For example, he finds that over 300,000 black 4-H’ers in the South faced gross exclusion from 4-H youth camps, and earlier still, financial resources left black extension agents (and black farmers) without resources. Rosenberg clearly perceives varied experiences—good, bad, and in-between—across and within race, class, and gendered groups. While black 4-H clubs remained underfunded and excluded in the United States through the 1960s, Cold War politics in the wake of WWII created a new place for 4-H’ers abroad. Rosenberg argues that international 4-H programs were essential to anticommunism efforts through detailed case studies of three such programs in Japan, Latin America, and Vietnam. Here, Rosenberg hints through the evidence he selects but does not build an explicit connection to a larger “empire” of education, as does A. J. Angulo in *Empire and Education* (2012).

The narrative in *The 4-H Harvest* is not driven by the development of individual characters. Instead, the main character is the 4-H institution as it was initiated, gained national membership, was standardized procedurally through ritual and symbolism, and finally,

expanded globally via affiliate clubs. A handful of leaders are featured as ushers of 4-H policy and reform advocates, but none drive the narrative like the *life* of the organization itself. Similarly, 4-H'ers are used as examples, rather than deeply examined characters. In this way, Rosenberg has accomplished his outlined task of an institutional history of 4-H. However, it is worth considering what, or in this case who, might be lost through this choice to foreground 4-H as a whole and not as a collection of individuals. Does he access farm life and the farm home or merely write *about* these experiences? Ultimately, Rosenberg's personal reflections offer bookends of positionality through which readers can create a frame for understanding the text, as he shares memories of driving on rural roads through Indiana farmland as a child and as an adult. Again, one is left with a sense that this text may leave you close to rural life and youth 4-H'ers but not within rural experience.

Despite these limited critiques, *The 4-H Harvest* promises to be fruitfully placed in classroom conversations and should be referenced by historians of education, particularly those developing research on vocationalism, noninstitutional education, extracurricular education, rural education, and common schools. For example, this text will work well in connection with Glenn Lauzon's forthcoming edited volume *Educating a Working Society*. Introductory social foundations classes would benefit from close readings of excerpted chapters, including chapter 1, "Agrarian Futurism, Rural Degeneracy, and the Origins of 4-H" for an alternative reading of the rural life movement. Similarly, queer political history could be engaged by selecting chapters 2–4 on rural manhood, 4-H body politics, and farm families. Important conversations can begin from this text. Rosenberg repeatedly probes what role institutions—like 4-H and various levels of governance—should play in private lives. Through examination of farm boys, farm girls, and farm families, he asks when is the body a public good to be shaped by the state? Further, conversations on gender and sexuality more often excluded from the history of common schools and rural consolidation can begin here.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

SARA CLARK

Jennifer Guiliano. *Indian Spectacle: College Mascots and the Anxiety of Modern America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2015. 194 pp. Hardcover \$80.00. Paper \$27.95.

Broad societal attention to Native American mascots has resurged recently with the prominent controversy over the Washington, DC, professional football team called the "R—skins"—a racial epithet for Native

Americans. This controversy is but one moment in a broader history of the use of Native American nicknames, mascots, and other symbols by professional, collegiate, and P through 12 sports teams. Controversies over these symbols are complicated for a number of reasons: the range of support and resistance among both Native Americans and non-Native Americans; the symbols that range from general monikers (R—skins and Indians) to Native American nations (Seminoles, Utes, etc.), some of which are permitted by the eponymous Native nation; the variety of sanctioned and unsanctioned fan practices that accompany Native American mascots; and some important differences between the goals of professional sports organizations, colleges, and P through 12 institutions.

These complexities can make it difficult to support sweeping judgments about the use of Native American symbols by sports teams, and thus require a close analysis of the particular historical contexts and networks that contributed to the use of Native American mascots. This is the primary strength of Jennifer Guiliano's book, *Indian Spectacle: College Mascots and the Anxiety of Modern America*, which offers a historical account of the complex relationship between the development of collegiate football, Native American mascots, and American masculinity in the first half of the twentieth century, with a particular focus on weaving together the stories of five universities: University of Illinois, Stanford University, Miami University, University of North Dakota, and Florida State University.

Guiliano opens her book with a description of the spectacle that accompanied the 1952 Rose Bowl match between the Stanford University Indians and the University of Illinois Fighting Illini. She highlights the performances of Chief Illiniwek—a white man dressed in Indian garb and trained in “Indian dance” through the Boy Scouts of America—and Prince Lightfoot—an enrolled member of the Yurok nation—as “the apex of what college football had been trying to accomplish for more than a century: a commercial spectacle that blended athletics, fan participation, and national audiences” (p. 1). This opening story serves as a synecdoche for her broader analysis of the construction of what she terms the “Indian spectacle.” Through the framework of American masculinity, her central argument is that the project of higher education after the Great War was enmeshed in masculine, racialized, classed, and nationalistic university identities that were expressed through football and the spectacle of faux Indian half-time shows. She tells a story not of Native American performances of identity, but of “how faux Indians performed a set of behaviors that white audiences perceived as representations of Indian culture and race” that highlight “how white middle-class men imagined themselves and constructed their own form of Indian identity by sampling from historical tropes, perceptions, and

misconceptions” (p. 9). This focus, while reminiscent of Philip J. Deloria’s *Playing Indian* (1998), provides a unique historical argument about the ways in which the faux Indian half-time performances in college football reveal wider cultural anxieties about masculinity, race, class, and education.

The book presents a chronological history that begins by sketching out the rise of college football in the early twentieth century, arguing that college football was a central vehicle through which white male middle-class identity was expressed and with which concomitant anxieties were grappled. Guiliano then turns to a fascinating examination of the origin of the University of Illinois’ Chief Illiniwek mascot tradition. She reveals how Chief Illiniwek’s performance, as well as other Native mascot performances, were tied to the activities of the Boy Scouts of America, particularly through a national network of jamborees at which white boys were taught supposedly authentic portrayals of Indian dancing. This chapter, and the remainder of the book, privileges the University of Illinois as a central player in the development of faux Indian performances in collegiate athletics.

The book’s narrative continues with an examination of the role of marching bands in college half-time shows. While the link between marching bands and faux Native half-time shows may not be immediately obvious, Guiliano articulates how the particular songs marching bands played contributed to the story being told in Native mascot performances. Guiliano then turns to a slightly muddled discussion of the limitations of the half-time spectacle, situating it as a phenomenon that was more common among large midwestern schools that had prominent football teams such as the University of Illinois. Yet smaller schools—in this case, the University of North Dakota and Miami University—also attempted to articulate athletic identity and broader college identity with Native Americans, even without the superior financial resources and audience base of larger universities.

Likewise expanding her gaze beyond the University of Illinois, the next chapter turns to the histories of Stanford University and Florida State University to reveal the important role of students in forming a university identity in an effort to grapple with their anxieties and “sense of who they were in the modern world” (p. 70). The case of Stanford reveals how students resisted university attempts to define student identity through an Indian mascot, whereas the case of Florida State demonstrates how athletes actively sought to create a university identity.

The final chapter focuses on the ways in which females and Native performers troubled the half-time spectacle in the 1940s and 1950s. By examining the performances of University of Illinois’s Princess Illiniwek and Stanford’s Prince Lightfoot (performed by a Yurok tribal

member) in relation to cartooned caricatures of Indians (Miami University), Guiliano argues that while they did allow for counternarratives, these performances ultimately “reaffirmed its [the collegiate community’s] desire for white male athletic bodies in service to the nation” (p. 105). Guiliano concludes the book with an argument for the importance of a rich historical account of the development of Native American collegiate mascots toward our collective understanding of contemporary struggles over representation and Native mascots.

The overall narrative of the book offers a sound and insightful analysis of the historical development of Native American mascots vis-à-vis cultural anxieties over race, class, and gender in the first half of the twentieth century. Yet despite the persuasiveness of this macronarrative, the micro level of historical detail in the arguments of individual chapters is at times somewhat wanting. While Guiliano relies on an impressive historical archive, at times her claims lack the development and strong evidence they deserve. For instance, at several points in the book, she makes claims about heteronormativity and the policing of homosexuality through the half-time spectacle performances. Yet these claims, while they support her larger interpretation, lack strong archival support. Likewise, while the overall argument of the book is clear, the arguments and narratives of individual chapters could have been clearer. Nonetheless, this book offers a valuable starting point for a better understanding of the historical development of collegiate mascots, faux Indian half-time shows, and their linkage to broader societal anxieties over higher education, race, class, and gender.

As a scholar writing from a university that uses Native American symbols for its sports teams—the “Utes” nickname and a drum and feather logo—I found that this book offered new insight and historical topoi that help me make sense of the historical and contemporary use of Native symbols at my university. I, therefore, recommend that scholars at universities that use Native symbols read this book. A notable absence in the book, however, is attention to the universities that have gained permission from eponymous Native American nations to use mascots and other symbols. While this falls outside the scope of her chosen historical time period of the 1920s–1950s, it represents a fascinating continuation of this historical relationship. How does permission by eponymous Native American nations, as is the case for Florida State and University of Utah, either trouble or reinforce this narrative of the role of the faux Indian half-time spectacle in managing white male middle-class identity? How does permission interact with the Native American mascot performers she discusses in the book?

Guiliano argues that her book is a “purely historical analysis. It makes no attempt to grapple with contemporary debates, ethics, or

voices” (p. 13). While this statement is understandable, I would argue that the book does move beyond a pure historical account in important ways. Indeed, the hallmark of this book is in bringing history to light in the contemporary conversation about Native American mascots. As Guiliano writes, “It is vital that we return to the historical roots of mascotry to understand its colonial contexts” (p. 110).

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

DANIELLE ENDRES

Andrew Woolford. *This Benevolent Experiment: Indigenous Boarding Schools, Genocide, and Redress in Canada and the United States*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2015. 431 pp. Hardcover \$90.00.

In this comparison of the settler colonial projects of residential/boarding school education in Canada and the United States, Andrew Woolford uses the term *genocide* for tactical reasons. Acknowledging that the term itself is not enough to prompt action, he argues that it can set the stage for a *decolonizing* redress (not a redress that maintains the status quo). In his conclusion, Woolford argues for a collective accountability for policies and practices that aimed to solve the “Indian Problem” by eliminating Indigenous groups. He highlights the alleged benevolence of said policies and practices in his title to make the point that benevolence itself can operate as a destructive force. Woolford frames his contribution to the scholarship on residential/boarding schools as the understanding that genocide is a complex process unfolding in an uneven manner. As accurate as that assessment may be, it is an unsatisfying answer to the two bold questions posed in the conclusion. In affluent settler colonial societies such as the United States and Canada, how do we radically alter a way of life? How do settlers come to grips with the fact that they live on and benefit from Indigenous lands? The eight chapters that precede the conclusion are full of details culled from archived interviews with boarding school survivors (such as the Doris Duke oral history interviews of the 1960s and 1970s and Sally Hyer’s transcripts of interviews from the Santa Fe Indian School), secondary literature from both countries, and testimonies presented to Canada’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The details and Woolford’s analyses of them cannot quite bear the weight of the two big questions that conclude the book, but the scale of his comparison, several interpretive insights, and the framing within genocide studies constitute significant contributions to residential/boarding school scholarship.

Making his use of the term *genocide* more historical and sociological than legal, Woolford roots his approach in a close reading of Raphael Lemkin's inclusive definition of genocide as a crime of group destruction: "A coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves" (p. 23). Woolford, following Lemkin, includes as the targets of genocide political and social institutions, language, culture, national feelings, religion, economic existence, personal security, liberty, health, dignity, and physical lives. Taking as a starting point the shared U.S./Canadian framing of Indigenous populations as problems to be solved—the "Indian Problem"—Woolford carefully examines the institutional residential school forms of assimilative education. Drawing on Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu, Woolford's analytic innovation is his notion of a "settler colonial mesh":

Settler colonial practices of assimilative education [operate] as a series of nets . . . at macro-, meso-, and microsocietal levels. These nets tighten or slacken as they stretch across space and time, and when brought together, one on top of the other, they form a *settler colonial mesh*, which operates to entrap Indigenous peoples within the settler colonial assimilative project (p. 3).

He is quick to note that the mesh is prone to "snags and tears" (p. 4), that Indigenous people are never only trapped or victims, that neither national assimilative project was homogenous, that local conditions pushed local schools in particular directions, and so on. The narrative compulsion to qualify, "complicate," and remind the reader of countervailing forces is a dominant thread throughout the chapters.

Woolford's systematic comparison of the two national systems is a first in the field, even though it is necessarily curtailed in size. He focuses on two schools in Manitoba (Portage la Prairie Indian Residential School and Fort Alexander Indian Residential School) and two schools in New Mexico (Santa Fe Indian School and Albuquerque Indian School). The four chapters focused on the schools are organized by topics and interpretive themes. The advantage of grouping discussion by themes such as "Discipline and Desire as Assimilative Techniques" (the title of chapter 5) is offset by a tendency to telescope the time frame. A significant portion of the analysis is set in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, with occasional excursions into the 1960s and 1970s. Given Woolford's own caveats that policies and practices changed over time (more, he argues, in the United States than in Canadian schools), his slides along the timeline sometimes damage the persuasiveness of the argument. Some pages convey the sense of a generic skim over the top, for example, the seven-page survey of "staff" who worked in the schools in both nations. Other pages read like a

frantic game of hopscotch, landing on snippets of evidence, when, for example, in chapter 6 (“Knowledge and Violence as Assimilative Techniques”) we bounce, in about a page and a half, from the profound relationships forged among students in adversity, and experiments with student self-government (the Santa Fe Indian School “tribal councils”), to aggression among students, and government ideologies of citizenship training (pp. 205–206).

To his credit, Woolford raises a number of topics and interpretive issues that have only sporadically (if ever) been addressed in the still-developing field of colonial schooling designed to eliminate Indigenous peoples. The marshaling of evidence across these four schools builds a foundation to begin to address persistent questions about the similarities and differences between a national system run by a federal bureaucracy (United States) versus a set of schools run by often-competitive denominations under nominal federal oversight (Canada). Questions of degrees and kinds of violence, including sexual abuses, have often been posed, but answers have been largely speculative. Woolford begins to build the evidentiary bases to consider such questions; in his view, the U.S. system was more permeable to reforms and more prone to use “softer” (albeit still quite damaging) forms of social and psychological violence. In chapter 5, discussion of disciplinary techniques is balanced against the cultivation of student “desires” identified by Jacqueline Fear-Segal—for cleanliness, order, and exotic foods, for example. At these moments, the reader might wish for less breadth and a deeper dive into the evidence and the questions the evidence prompts.

That frustration came to the fore in my reading of chapter 7, “Local Actors and Assimilation.” Here, Woolford takes the innovative and long-overdue tack of considering “nonhuman actors” in advancing or resisting the boarding school objectives. He misses some prior literature that analyzes the impact of architecture, spatial arrangement, and arts and crafts instruction but still builds a compelling case to consider the impacts of space, territory, time, diseases, health, memory, clocks, food, poverty, and depictions of hell. The chapter suffers from the hopscotch problem, though. Too many snippets are crammed together without the analytical space to breathe. The overcrowding is most disturbing in the juxtaposition under the subheading “Blood” of the real, red blood of physical violence, the categorical blood of quantum identification, an unsubstantiated reference to “shaming” girls for menstrual blood, and the so-called evolutionary “limitations” of Indian blood (pp. 253–256). The assumptions, corollaries, and implications packed into this list are worthy of careful and considered thought. In the jargon of our times, they deserve—in fact, demand—unpacking. Woolford is to be commended for bringing so much to the table. One hopes his scholarship

will continue to unfold, unpack, and illuminate Indigenous experiences with colonial schools.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

K. TSIANINA LOMAWAIMA

Melissa Bingmann. *Prep School Cowboys: Ranch Schools in the American West*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2015. 230 pp. Hardcover \$45.00.

Theodore Roosevelt's pilgrimage to the Dakota Badlands in the 1880s became the stuff of western legend: an ambitious young man, with somewhat delicate childhood health, transformed into vigorous manhood by his western experiences. Several decades later, Roosevelt sent his son and nephew to the Evans School in Arizona, hoping that they, too, would benefit from a western educational experience. The Evans School was one of a group of elite ranch schools that emerged in the American Southwest in the early twentieth century. In *Prep School Cowboys: Ranch Schools in the American West*, Melissa Bingmann argues that these schools drew on mythic images of the American West to offer a distinctively regional manifestation of select private school education. Bingmann posits that ranch schools "promised the elite that through 'simplicity of living,' ranch life would develop 'self-reliance' and courage in boys—character traits that many Americans feared had been lost in modern urban society" (p. xiii). Connecting themes of western tourism, private school education, and gender in interwar America, Bingmann offers an intriguing study of how a group of educational entrepreneurs used the myth of the "Old West" to establish and advertise these unique schools.

Bingmann organizes her chapters thematically, and at the heart of each chapter rests a tension between ideology and practice. Ranch schools gained popularity as a response to concerns about the "problems of the rich man's son" (p. 1). As the successful, self-made industrialists of the Gilded Age gave way to the second and third generations of inherited wealth, observers feared that affluence undermined the character of the sons and grandsons of America's elite. Ranch schools, located in isolated communities and built around the themes of hard work and self-reliance, offered parents a way to protect their children from the frivolity and vice connected with material abundance and urban life, while preparing them to be a new generation of leaders. But ranch schools' claims that the West was a place free of materialism, Bingmann contends, belied the fact that attending the schools was itself a

process of elite consumption. Tuition at the schools was “exorbitant,” and students purchased everything from lassos to saddles and cowboy boots to facilitate their participation in western life (pp. 1 and 24–25).

A second tension arose from the schools’ claim to provide a rigorous preparatory education while cultivating a character-building ethos of manual labor. Although geographically distant from the Select Sixteen, ranch schools relied on networks with eastern preparatory schools and maintained curricular programs designed to allow students to transfer between the schools. At the same time, they offered experiential learning in a uniquely western context; students engaged (albeit in an often limited fashion) in ranch life. They camped, hunted, and participated in other outdoor activities designed to teach self-reliance and encourage physical health and vigor. Bingmann describes “ranch schools’ strong attachment to the study of American regions and locales by immersing students in the local culture and geography” as having “replicated aspects of the early twentieth-century progressive schools,” but her discussion of progressivism highlights her sometimes selective use of existing historiography (p. 41). Her sole secondary source citation regarding progressive education is Lawrence Cremin’s *The Transformation of the School* (1964). It does not detract from Cremin’s importance in the field to note that scholars have had quite a bit to say about progressivism since his seminal book, and Bingmann’s selective use of the historiography limits her ability to contextualize child-centered practices and fully analyze the professionalization of headmasters and their creation of professional networks.

Ranch schools relied on a regional identity that presented the Old West as a place to forge individuality and independence. Promoters also assured parents that the schools were “civilized, safe, and located near urban conveniences” (p. 65). Thus contradictions emerged as headmasters promised parents that students would experience a “rugged yet protected version of the Old West through geographic isolation, restricted encounters with indigenous cultures, overnight camping trips, and other ranch activity intended to cultivate self-reliance” (pp. 65–66). Landscape, architecture, and selective use of art visually reinforced eastern assumptions about western culture, while marginalizing the contemporary Indigenous and Mexican-American residents. Recreational activities, particularly rodeos and horseback riding, contributed to students’ “western” experience. Yet headmasters strove to carry out these activities in a protected fashion.

Promoters stressed that western spaces cultivated character growth, and Bingmann’s fourth chapter explores how ranch schools constructed masculinity in the West to create “the popular conception of the West as moral space” (p. 108). Here, Bingmann’s analysis closely follows the framework of progressive manhood described

by Gail Bederman (1995). Physical activity, including controlled displays of violence through branding, roping, and hunting, promised to “rid individuals of debasing character traits and turn men into successful gentleman cowboys” (p. 116). Actual cowboy behavior, however, could be problematic: swearing, smoking, excessive drinking, and frequenting prostitutes remained decidedly ungentlemanly. Schools, therefore, emphasized a mythic version of the cowboy, rooted in ideas of independence and an inherent moral code, to instill character development in their students.

Bingmann’s final chapter focuses on the homelike aspects of ranch schools. Psychologists and self-proclaimed parenting “experts” during the Progressive Era argued that overprotective and uninformed parents presented a danger to their children. Scientific child-raising in a family-like atmosphere was best, and ranch schools promised to create family environments by removing students from their potentially harmful parents. Headmasters’ wives and school matrons served important roles as “civilizers” within this framework, teaching students conventional manners, planning holiday gatherings, and supervising domestic staff. Ultimately, Bingmann argues, the gendered division of labor between headmasters and their wives reflected both middle-class expectations and the pattern of preindustrial agricultural labor.

The study of ranch schools in the interwar years offers insight into the ways place and regional identity can affect educational philosophy and practice. The primary sources Bingmann uses, including advertising materials from the schools and interviews with former students, bring the experiences of these children to life. In highlighting the tensions inherent in the schools’ development, Bingmann provides a fascinating look at one of the ways the myths of the American West manifested in actual institutions and experiences, and offers important avenues for considering the intersections between tourism, education, class, and gender. Bingmann’s discussion of gender, however, left me wondering about the extent to which girls’ experiences at the schools were different from that of boys, and the effects the western setting had on constructions of femininity at the schools.

The lack of attention to femininity connects with a somewhat problematic tendency regarding Bingmann’s use of her sources. On occasion, she presents examples of girls’ experiences at coeducational or all-female schools in order to support descriptions of supposedly masculine activities. At the girls’ school Hacienda del Sol, female students remembered cacti planted outside their windows and speculated the strategic placement was designed to block anyone from entering or leaving. While headmasters no doubt hoped to limit interactions between students and community for both boys and girls, it is not necessarily accurate to assume that they did so for the same reasons. Here,

Bingmann misses an opportunity to consider whether isolation was advertised as providing the same rugged individualism for female students as it did for male students. Another example emerges in Bingmann's discussion of the ranch schools' integration of "masculine virtue based on restrained violence" through activities like hunting and branding (p. 123). She includes the following example from the coeducational Orme School: "Student Suzy Royce wrote, 'Foreman roped, Charlie cut ears and horns off, and Mr. Orme branded and vaccinated. . . . Jennie, Carol, Cinda, Jeb, and Jolly all took turns painting the calves with bug medicine'" (p. 123). A second anecdote specifically identifies a male student as involved in the act of branding, but Suzy Royce's comments describe girls participating in at least some parts of the process. Bingmann draws a more successful distinction with her discussion of hunting, where her evidence demonstrates that girls did not participate in hunting at the coeducational Orme School, nor did any of the girls' schools provide hunting activities (p. 125). More careful attention to the differences between the boys' and girls' activities at the schools could provide a richer understanding of the ways in which ranch schools did and did not reinforce contemporary gender structures.

Bingmann's study expands our understanding of the many manifestations of education in the American West, the construction and maintenance of mythical western identities, and the ongoing institutional connections between the West and the East. Historians of American education and the American West will find the book a useful examination of the importance of place in education, particularly when educators articulate self-conscious connections between environment and education. It marks an interesting tale in the gradually expanding literature regarding education in the American West.

MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

MICHELLE M. K. MORGAN

Stephanie Hinnershitiz. *Race, Religion, and Civil Rights: Asian Students on the West Coast, 1900–1968*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2015. 258 pp. Hardcover \$90.00. Paper \$28.95.

In *Race, Religion, and Civil Rights*, Hinnershitiz argues that the formation of Christian-inspired civil rights activism on the West Coast occurred through the leadership of Asian college student organizations in the early part of the twentieth century. Her research builds on contemporary studies of the modern civil rights movement but adds a unique dimension by foregrounding Asian student activism as a precursor to

Asian-American student movements on college campuses. In essence, she offers a new angle to view the nuance of racial formation and resistance from what she refers to as a mainstream activist lens. Throughout the book, the author maintains the central idea that “Although the students may not have viewed themselves as radical in the sense that most historians use the term, their combination of Christian critiques of imperialism and nationalism and the connection of these problems to racism and prejudice in the United States were unique and revolutionary for the time” (pp. 132–133).

The book adds to the small but growing historiography of Asian and Asian-American students’ experiences in higher education. What makes this book original is that it makes Protestantism central to Asian international students’ promotion of racial equality in the United States. The author combs through archival data across the United States related to Asian and Asian-American student, cultural, and labor organizations to trace the when and where of Asian student presence on college campuses. Laying evidence for her claims, she posits, “Protestant Asians applied Protestant Christian principles to the problems with race and discrimination they encountered in America, bridging their identities as Asians, students, and transnational agents. Protestant Asian students present an opportunity for historians and scholars to examine the influence of their political and religious backgrounds on concepts of equality, rights, and citizenship in the United States” (p. 7).

In doing so, Hinnershitz tells a narrative set against the backdrop of the rising tide of anti-Asian legislation and riots in California, Oregon, and Washington from the early twentieth century to after World War II. As the focus of the book concerns Asian (international) students’ experiences with U.S. racism, the author interweaves the difficult challenges the students faced in terms of the “politics of transpacific ties” (p. 107). The Asian student group alliances on college campuses were tested throughout the decades with the onslaught of conflict between China and Japan, especially as it affected members within the Chinese Students’ Christian Association (CSCA) in North America and the Japanese Students’ Christian Association in North America (JSCA). At the time, U.S. imperialist forces in the Philippines (as well as in Guam and Puerto Rico) also raised dialogue within the Filipino Students’ Christian Movement (FSCM) about the importance of Christian solidarity and global Christian citizenship. While student leaders in all three organizations vocalized Christian principles of equality and justice to rise above the fray of racism and international discord, some of the obstacles became too daunting, especially post-World War II.

Divided into six chapters, the book focuses on the development of the largest Asian Christian student organizations on the West Coast mentioned above. The first two chapters provide contextual grounding

of the Asian college students' experience with racism on campus and surrounding communities. At the time Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino students made up the largest contingent of international students in California, Oregon, and Washington. Set against the backdrop of ecumenicalism and cosmopolitanism in the early twentieth century, the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA), the World Student Christian Federation, and the Committee on Friendly Relations became sponsors to the Asian Christian organizations on college campuses, largely through ideological and logistical support. As Hinnershitz notes, however, from the late 1920s onward, Asian students began to question the lack of response of its parent groups in addressing "unchristian" behavior among Americans, especially in regard to race. Realizing their racialized status as Asians in the United States branded them as inferior, the student groups became more vocal in addressing the hypocrisy of Christian ideals. In particular, the Chinese and Japanese students recognized how immigration and citizenship restrictions and antialien land laws affected their American-born brethren.

For Filipino students, the passage of the Tydings-McDuffie Act in 1934, which granted the Philippines commonwealth status, reclassified Filipinos as "aliens," further restricting access to citizenship. Filipino students' role in labor activism across the West Coast chronicles the localized and global struggles for equal treatment and citizenship. The rise of Trinidad A. Rojo, for example, a University of Washington student who spent summers working in the Alaskan canning industry, and who would become the president of the Cannery Workers' and Farm Laborers' Union, Local 7, highlights the merging of Christian ideals with labor and racial equality. Furthermore, Rojo's subsequent involvement with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Congress of Racial Equality provides more evidence of the multiracial formation of activism from international and domestic students.

Chapters three through five chronicle more details of each respective ethnic Christian organization, its members, leaders, and staff, and their response to international unrest. For many within the student groups, debates between militarism and pacifism surfaced, especially with respect to whether or not China should seek military action against Japan. Expanding debates beyond themselves, Hinnershitz details how the series of interracial Christian conferences held throughout college campuses assisted in setting the stage for multiracial activist coalitions in the 1960s. Despite the critical networks and proposals for action developed by the student organizations, the reality of the Second World War and the subsequent evacuation orders for the West Coast Japanese Americans proved too much. The JSCA disbanded after its leader, Toru Matsumoto, was detained by the Immigration and

Naturalization Service in Fort Meade, Maryland. The CSCA and FSCM experienced further challenges after losing administrative and financial support from its parent organization, the YMCA, which focused more on war relief efforts. Even with these setbacks, the author maintains in the final chapter that during the postwar and Cold War eras, Christian association leaders such as Chingwah Lee, Toru Matsumoto, Victor Carreon, and Victorio Velasco “continued to influence a changing civil rights movement on the West Coast” (p. 177). What she proffers is a shifting view of twentieth-century civil rights history that accounts for a more expansive understanding of activism.

Great in the narrative detail of the histories of the student organizations, the author largely accomplishes the task of having historians reconsider the nature of multiethnic formations for racial equality from the standpoint of Asian college students. One question that remains is the degree to which there were conversations and collaborations between the Christian student groups and the National Conference of Christians and Jews (NCCJ), given the attention paid in historical scholarship about the NCCJ’s role in increasing international brotherhood and intercultural understanding in the public schools. Further questions with regard to connections between local ethnic churches, temples, and community organizations remain. Nevertheless, Hinner-shitz’s work is timely and important to consider, especially given the current landscape of Asian international student populations on many of our college campuses and their subsequent developing identities as racialized bodies.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

YOON K. PAK

Carlos Kevin Blanton. *George I. Sánchez: The Long Fight for Mexican American Integration*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014. 383 pp. Cloth \$45.00.

At the beginning of my academic career in 1968, I found myself in the state of Florida, about which I knew next to nothing, having been born, raised, and educated in Cleveland, Ohio, and having finished my doctoral degree at The Ohio State University in Columbus. Moving to Florida proved to be the beginning of a southern odyssey for me, which has lasted to the current time. Yet, the Southwest at that time was as alien to southern and southeastern scholars as it was to midwestern and most northeastern scholars. The contact between regions was haphazard and incidental at best. Still, in spite of this reality, I remember hearing just

a bit about George Sánchez of the University of Texas and thinking that this was someone worthy of more than cursory attention. Carlos Blanton's recent biography of Sánchez is a convincing illustration of Sánchez's importance, not only for Mexican Americans and historians of Mexican-American education but for all Americans and all historians of American education. Blanton gives us a rich, complex, and nuanced story of Sánchez's life; yet the life and its description have an accessibility that attracts many, like me, who were, or are, not directly involved in the struggles, scholarly and political, that characterized Sánchez's experience.

Blanton does not seem to set out to seek a broad audience for his work, concentrating instead on making Sánchez, a giant of the Mexican-American generation of scholars and activists of the mid-twentieth century, understandable to the Chicana/o generation that followed. But Sánchez's story is of interest to those of us not directly involved in the movements of Mexican Americans, or who are not Chicana/o activists or scholars of that heritage that seek to understand and ameliorate the conditions of their people. Sánchez's early experiences included activity in the state Education Association of New Mexico and support from the General Education Board, both of which were prominent in the background of many African-American scholar-activists of the early and mid-twentieth century. And Sánchez himself understood this affinity and tried to build on it to strengthen his own studies, and his political work, by learning from the work of African-American and other non-Mexican American activists. Regarding the education association in New Mexico, Sánchez rose to president of the group and championed educational reforms, such as financial equalization, vigorously, if not always successfully. In fact, Sánchez's commitment to reform, both ideologically and politically, often got him in trouble with conservative politicians in New Mexico and eventually led to his flight from the state to achieve his doctoral degree in California. While in New Mexico, Sánchez operated in relatively orthodox progressive educational fashion, including support for standardized testing at the same time he published vigorous criticism of IQ and IQ-like tests as unjustly determinative of Mexican-American underachievement.

Most of Sánchez's career, however, was based in Texas, not in New Mexico, a point not wasted on Blanton. Sánchez served on the faculty of the College of Education at the University of Texas for three decades, involving himself both in substantial scholarship and vigorous political activism. The major objective of Blanton's book is to make understandable Sánchez's lifelong commitment to the integration of Mexican Americans into American society. This is not, in the current scholarly and political climate, a particularly popular commitment. Blanton understands this and explores Sánchez's integrationist bent

extensively, going so far as to call him an assimilationist at times. This is surely something that is, at the least, potentially alienating to current Chicana/o activists and scholars who seek genuine pluralism rather than assimilation or amalgamation. Sánchez, however, was consistent in his advocacy of integration, mainly through educational means and methods, as the ultimate goal for himself and his people. Blanton succeeds, at least to this reviewer, in making Sánchez's reasons and arguments for integration seem comprehensive and convincing. Sánchez's goal, and that of contemporary Chicana/o scholars and activists, is the betterment of their people. For Sánchez, the choice of integration as the means to achieving this goal is well-contextualized historically as explained by Blanton. At times, he seems to endorse Sánchez and his activities completely, while occasionally he also exposes the weakness in the assimilationist tendency of integrationists to denigrate the culture of the Mexican Americans of Sánchez's generation and their descendants.

An interesting sidelight of the analysis, at least to this reviewer, is the look inside the University of Texas and its College of Education in the years in which Sánchez served. His commitment to his students and to his university stands out, even if it was not always, in fact if it was not often, reciprocated. Sánchez's constant dissatisfaction with his salary as well as his shifting place in the internal dynamics of the College of Education, and the various departmental arrangements in which he lived in the college, are also of interest. Moving from a departmental home in history and philosophy of education to one in an educational studies unit did not bother Sánchez particularly, but it did reflect a change in departmental leadership that, at the same time it embraced interdisciplinary initiatives such as educational foundations or educational studies, also turned its back on one of its members who exhibited those initiatives at their best in his own work. This is not of great interest to Blanton, nor should it necessarily be. But it shows dynamics that those of us who work in colleges of education either have experienced, are experiencing, or will experience in our careers. Late to the game, our colleagues in departments of history may well experience similar professional dislocations as the humanities and social sciences struggle for survival in an increasingly technocratic university environment.

The above-mentioned digressions aside, Carlos Blanton has given us a compelling and convincing look at a scholar-activist of Mexican Americans and of the southwestern part of the United States. The publication of this volume by Yale University Press in the Lamar Series in Western History is also significant. Western history is an increasingly popular focus in the American historical profession. It is also an up-and-coming area of focus in American educational history, as epitomized in the recent successful session on Education in the West at the 2015 History of Education Society meeting. The shift in the editorship of

the *History of Education Quarterly* editorial offices to the University of Washington is still another indicator of the increasing significance of the West as a subject of more scholarly attention and a region of increasing scholarly activity.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

WAYNE J. URBAN