

husband, and a father. A dour disciplinarian who worked himself into an early grave, Hope was a sensitive man with a capacity for introspection, self-criticism, and loyal friendship. Although Davis admires his subject's ability to reconcile pragmatism with principle, he examines Hope's flaws and traces the ups and downs of his marriage to Lugenia Burns (an important activist in her own right) with honesty. This fine study convincingly demonstrates that John Hope was one of the most important southern black leaders between Booker T. Washington and Martin Luther King Jr.

Adam Fairclough  
*University of East Anglia*  
*Norwich, United Kingdom*

*Exotics at Home: Anthropologies, Others, American Modernity.* By Micaela di Leonardo. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998. xvi, 445 pp. \$35.00, ISBN 0-226-47263-9.)

Micaela di Leonardo's *Exotics at Home* is an ambitious and opinionated book. It levels two charges against the discipline of anthropology. The first is that the field has neglected issues of political economy and, in the process, formulated a study of culture that overlooks dynamics of power. The second and related argument is that anthropologists have engaged in an "anthropological gambit" that posited arguments about others ostensibly to learn about ourselves, but they have typically known little about the history and culture of the United States. The consequence of those blind spots is a discipline that has fed a popular appetite for the exotic elsewhere without attending to serious problems of political and economic power either at home or in the increasingly global and interconnected world.

Few escape the strong criticisms this book levels, but Margaret Mead stands as the lightning rod. This is partly because her life spans the chronology from the Boasians of the early twentieth century through the second-wave feminists and into the present (Mead died in 1978). Mead also shares the liberal predispositions, including Cold War sympathies, that di Leonardo blames for the intellectual and political failures of the anthropological study of culture. A larger-than-life figure, Mead captured the public imagination, representing Samoans and others to Americans and Ameri-

cans to themselves. Her status as a public intellectual of the anthropological variety also made her the target for more recent conservative critiques of cultural determinism (as di Leonardo rightly points out, the responses to Derek Freeman's 1983 book *Margaret Mead and Samoa* were more revealing than the book itself).

Despite claims about the need to historicize, however, the book evidences surprise and even outrage that its subjects act like the historically contingent figures they are. That Mead's feminism emphasized the centrality of reproduction and family to women's roles brands her an intellectual failure, for instance. Rather she appears to have been a revealing example of second-wave feminism, with its universalizing of white, middle-class women's experience and their difference from men. In this sense, *Exotics at Home* mixes historical material with a relentless presentism. A kind of inverted whiggishness drives the argument to find the origins of the failures we now perceive, without pausing to ask why they took that form.

Alternately fascinating and frustrating, *Exotics at Home* combines significant research with detailed, even petty, attacks. Among its strengths are the terrific examples of how anthropological scholarship was represented in popular culture, from the highbrow *New Yorker's* preoccupation with things savage and civilized to the proliferation of consumer indulgences in exoticism. The book is also learned and thorough, synthesizing literature in a range of disciplines to explain the institutional and political contexts in which anthropologists worked (often without acknowledging them). The sharp criticisms of other scholars won't make any friends, and, more importantly, they distract the reader from the more interesting and valuable argument this book offers.

Julia E. Liss  
*Scripps College*  
*Claremont, California*

*From Savage to Negro: Anthropology and the Construction of Race, 1896–1954.* By Lee D. Baker. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998. xii, 325 pp. Cloth, \$40.00, ISBN 0-520-21167-7. Paper, \$17.95, ISBN 0-520-21168-5.)

During the past decade several historians and historically minded anthropologists, such as Elazar Barkan, Carl N. Degler, Faye V. Harrison, Marshall Hyatt, Audrey Smedley, and I, have contributed to the secondary literature on the history of anthropology's reference to so-called "savages." The net effect of these efforts has been to broaden their audiences' understanding of how and why anthropology transformed itself from a field in the nineteenth century that rationalized innumerable crimes against humanity to a professional, social science discipline that, to use Lee D. Baker's graphic wording, advances "research that exposes the contradictions in the U.S. society in an effort to reconcile the ideal of racial equality with the nagging, persistent, and seemingly perpetual forms of oppression." Indeed, *From Savage to Negro*, which is immaculately conceptualized and developed, well written, and highly original, is an important and valuable contribution to this subfield of American intellectual history.

What distinguishes Baker's work from most of the previous generation's is that his is not a simple regurgitation of the internal conceptual discourses or the politics of personalities during the years between the Supreme Court's rulings in *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896 and *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954. Although the internal developments were certainly significant, which is made clear by Baker's adumbrations of such developments as Franz Boas's revolt against the cultural evolutionism of the preacademic pioneers of anthropology in America, Boas's success at professionalizing the discipline, and the eventual entrance of African Americans into twentieth-century anthropology, they are not Baker's main entrée. Instead, he is intent on demonstrating anthropology's influence on American popular culture, through such examples as world's fairs, popular monthlies, and the "New Negro" movement, on political trends, and on judicial decisions. In so doing, he clearly shows the linkages between rarefied social scientific debates and public policy.

Nevertheless, I have two reservations in reference to Baker's excellent work. First, his sketchy reference to the Enlightenment, which is beyond the scope of his book, suggests that all ethnologists of that period were racists. Yet, scholars during the Enlightenment in America such as Samuel Stanhope Smith and Benjamin

Rush were committed to monogenism, the theory that supported the unity of humankind. Unlike the polygenists, who emerged after 1810 and who turned their backs on the universalistic creed of the eighteenth century to rationalize a racism that excluded "savages" from the domain of "people," Enlightenment ethnologists attributed the state of "savages" to the external environment.

My second reservation centers on his last chapter, which is also outside the boundaries of the study. Although the latest group of racial reactionaries opposes race-conscious remedies as a solution to racial problems and uses appeals to a color-blind rhetoric, most sophisticated persons see through their disingenuousness. Nevertheless, to my mind, the integration of African Americans into a color-blind society is still the most humanistic and cosmopolitan goal to be pursued.

Despite these reservations, Baker's work is splendid and deserves the close attention of scholars and educated lay persons alike.

Vernon J. Williams Jr.  
Purdue University  
West Lafayette, Indiana

*Structures of the Jazz Age: Mass Culture, Progressive Education, and Racial Discourse in American Modernism.* By Chip Rhodes. (New York: Verso, 1998. vi, 218 pp. Cloth, \$60.00, ISBN 1-85984-833-8. Paper, \$19.00, ISBN 1-85984-200-3.)

Chip Rhodes's wide-ranging study attempts to be a corrective to treatments of American modernism that oversimplify that varied and various decade, the 1920s. It begins by rehearsing major theorists of early American twentieth-century intellectual and literary life from Frederick Lewis Allen and Frederick Hoffman and Hugh Kenner through Ann Douglas; it provides some cogent if not always clear summaries of the writers who gave us the version of the 1920s that we, by and large, accept today. In so doing, Rhodes sets up a paradigm that is cautionary: today we can no longer accept the notion of romance, nor the definition of American literature as escape narrative.

He takes two chapters of his comparatively brief book to establish the ground rules he privileges: finding a suitable approach by