

This is not Applebaum's first book on construction, and much of it is an updated version of an earlier work titled *Royal Blue: The Culture of Construction Workers* (Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1981). For roughly the first 120 pages, the argument and organization are largely the same, as are most of the colorful anecdotes. The references, however, are fully updated—indeed, for those interested in construction the bibliography is a treasure. It is only in the last two chapters, relating to the situation of women and minorities in the construction industry, that this volume breaks new ground. And to my mind, the arguments Applebaum builds in these lengthy concluding chapters warrant a reconsideration of the argument and organization of the work as a whole. There are, in effect, two books here, and their coexistence is far from symbiotic.

The tone of the book as a whole is more descriptive than analytical, more concerned to inventory and survey than to probe and question. Nonetheless, it makes several lucid arguments. Two of these belong to the older portion of the book, and largely amplify the arguments of *Royal Blue*. First, it is clear that Applebaum still subscribes to an exceptionalist stance on the nature of the construction industry. According to this argument, construction work diverges from the dominant pattern of bureaucratic control and de-skilling in the goods producing sector due to the unique characteristics of its products and work processes. It thus presents an anomalous, quasi-utopian scenario of craft administration, worker autonomy, and high job satisfaction. Second, he takes an approach rather similar to cultural ecology in interpreting worker culture. He proposes that the technological and organizational imperatives of the industry result in a value orientation that is adaptive to the social and material circumstances of the job site. Or, as Applebaum puts it, "construction worker's behavior is appropriate for the social organization and technology of the industry" (p. 111).

Such arguments obviously are not going to thrill an academic audience now largely distant from functionalism, and this theoretical foundation, in combination with the descriptive tenor, make this book seem an echo of an earlier era. However, his third argument, which emerges in his greatly enlarged reflections on resistance to affirmative action in construction, may draw more interest. In these two concluding chapters, making up nearly a third of the book, Applebaum offers a vigorous case for effective affirmative action plans and a passionate plea to transcend the persistent opposition to diversity in the industry. His arguments are clearly heartfelt. The whole tone of this section is sharply at odds with the celebratory account of construction workers and their industry up to that point. Suddenly, Applebaum deploys a critical voice condemning the complicity of contractors, unions, and individual workers in restricting and opposing the entry of women and non-whites to the field. He explores the larger legal and political context, offering a historical perspective sorely lacking in the preceding chapters. And as he develops this critical, historical context, he thoroughly destabilizes his earlier functionalist arguments. It is clear that the culture of construction workers is profoundly shaped by the larger cultural economy of race and gender and that, in this regard, the industry is far from exceptional on the American scene. There is another change worth noting that occurs alongside this shift to a historical, critical style. While the older portion of the book is replete with first person observations and anecdotes, his discussion of gender and race is almost entirely based on secondary

sources. Thus, a curious distance opens between the blue-collar royalty celebrated in the first hundred pages and the segregated world revealed thereafter.

If the problematic of race and gender opened rather than closed the analysis, this would likely have been a different book, oriented to understanding the world of construction workers in a larger cultural historical context, and seeking the contradictions between the white male fraternity and the divisions of race and gender that it is founded on. This is clearly not the book Applebaum set out to write. Nonetheless, in the tensions between his celebratory account of the work culture of an American labor aristocracy and his critical angst at the racism and sexism that enshroud it, his work poses a critical question that future studies cannot avoid. ♦♦

**From Savage to Negro: Anthropology and the Construction of Race, 1896–1954.** Lee D. Baker. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998. 325 pp.

FAYE V. HARRISON  
*University of Tennessee*

At a moment when anthropology is experiencing a resurgence of interest in race and when biological determinism is regaining authority in some circles, Lee D. Baker provides a magisterial history of the social construction of this invidious social distinction in U.S. society. In many respects, his book takes off where Audrey Smedley's *Race in North America* (Westview Press, [1993]1999) ends. His project also resonates with the research direction St. Clair Drake encouraged in his pursuit of intellectual traditions and trajectories excluded from the anthropological canon.

Baker's study examines a period of time beginning and ending with momentous Supreme Court decisions that redefined the national contours of race. *Plessy v. Ferguson* and *Brown v. Board of Education*—along with the broader confluence of forces that made them possible—reshaped the meanings and structures of race. Working with a wealth of historical evidence, Baker elucidates the social processes of race-making at work in the early discipline's interactions with major political currents, watershed legal struggles, popular cultural representations, and wider intellectual trends.

Embedding intellectual trends in a broader social history, Baker's reconstruction of anthropology's early professionalization sheds critical light on the relationship the discipline cultivated with a public discourse grounded in scientific racism. The scientists who naturalized the status quo under slavery and Jim Crow included prominent anthropologists rewarded with prestigious academic positions, generous funding, and powerful leadership roles. His close reading of the historical record exposes the extent to which anthropological science appropriated and converted into "scientific fact" the racist language and stereotypic imagery of popular magazines, minstrel shows, and feature films, which were themselves fashioned by the media's selective appropriation of science. Baker's discussion of how anthropological notions of racial hierarchy were dramatically popularized in major public exhibitions is particularly poignant. At a time when a professional code of ethics was virtually nonexistent,

ethnological Otherness was starkly displayed in zoo-like exhibits of live "savages."

While focused principally on the construction of blackness, Baker situates his analysis within a wider context of racialization. Accordingly, he maps his analytical terrain so that race riots targeting blacks, massacres of Native Americans, and restrictions on Southern and Eastern European immigration can all be viewed relationally through the same multifocal lens. His optic also extends beyond domestic affairs to foreign policy and international relations. He illuminates how a biodeterminist racial paradigm informed U.S. foreign policy from Cuba and Haiti to the Philippines and Samoa.

Baker's analysis is at its best when he turns his attention to the political and intellectual projects that combatted Social Darwinism, Eugenics, and Jim Crow. In the second half of the book, he delineates how the paradigmatic shift from Social Darwinism and separate but equal was achieved through a biracial coalition that culminated in the *Brown* decision. He argues that Boasian ideas became effective anti-racist tools when African American scholars and activists selectively appropriated them in their arguments and litigation against the racist status quo. The story Baker tells of anthropology's collaboration with black activist scholarship begins with the relationship between Franz Boas and W. E. B. Du Bois, who both arrived at similar ideas around the same time. Baker makes the important claim that Du Bois's scholarship "was a precursor for the paradigmatic shift in the social sciences that is rightly credited to Boas" (p. 107). In view of recent scholarship interrogating Du Bois's erasure from the history of anthropology as well as his absence from Boas's citations, without directly addressing the latter point Baker offers important insights into the differential locations of black and white intellectuals in the structure of academic knowledge production. By virtue of Boas's whiteness—even his Jewish whiteness—and more strategic position in the academic world, he had greater impact on the social sciences. Du Bois's work, however, was influential among black intellectuals and activists, a few of whom became anthropologists.

Baker's analysis of the relationship between Boasian anthropology and black intellectual trajectories such as the New Negro Movement and the Howard circle is a peerless contribution. In their attempt to validate African American culture and "transform a [race] into an ethnic identity" (p. 141), New Negro intellectuals engaged anthropological ideas and folkloric data. Baker elucidates their alliance with the Boasian American Folklore Society and its *Journal of American Folklore (JAF)*. In special issues on black folklore, the journal published the work of many black scholars—from Zora Neale Hurston and Arthur Faust, formally trained as anthropologists, to now largely unknown faculty and students at historically black institutions such as Hampton Institute. In the context of his richly textured discussion on the significance of black folklore, Baker also looks beyond the *JAF*'s institutional orbit by discussing the work of anthropologists Katherine Dunham and Irene Diggs, the latter of whom was firmly situated within the Du Boisian tradition.

Baker positions historically black Howard University on the national landscape as an academic center where important interventions were made in jurisprudence and social science. Professors E. Franklin Frazier, Ralph Bunche, and Charles Hamilton Houston (Thurgood Marshall's law professor) synthesized ideas

from Boas and Robert Park along with those from sociological jurisprudence. Baker characterizes the Howard circle as a radical variant of the Chicago school. Its ideas influenced Gunnar Myrdal's *An American Dilemma* (1944), which in turn influenced the logical structure and contents of the argument Marshall articulated in *Brown*. Baker's analysis of the intricacies of the legal strategy Marshall and his colleagues used—their carefully selective use of social science research, their choice of expert witnesses (e.g., Robert Redfield but not Melville Herskovits), and their manipulation of postwar sentiments—is an excellent examination of the imbrication of knowledge and power in a struggle for social change.

Baker ends with thought-provoking reflections on current trends. He draws interesting, and troubling, parallels with earlier periods of racial realignment, urging readers to think seriously about the role anthropologists can play in present-day struggles over race's social significance and political stakes. Baker's book makes an important contribution to the history of anthropology, social history, the sociology of knowledge, critical legal studies, and African American studies. It should be read widely, especially by anthropologists and their students. ♦♦

**She Comes to Take Her Rights: Indian Women, Property, and Propriety.** *Srimati Basu*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999. 306 pp.

**Womanhood in the Making: Domestic Ritual and Public Culture in Urban South India.** *Mary Elizabeth Hancock*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1999. 286 pp.

**Women, Family, and Child Care in India: A World in Transition.** *Susan C. Seymour*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 323 pp.

BARBARA D. MILLER  
*George Washington University*

Ethnographers of the 1950s and 1960s, at least those trained in the United States, had clear goals and defined methods. Carrying (perhaps mentally) a copy of the latest version of *Notes and Queries*, ethnographers-to-be of that era were protected from worry about their biases by faith in the scientific method. They were confident that their contribution to building a knowledge base of world cultures was unconnected to United States global expansionism.

In the late 1980s and 1990s, many ethnographers, at least those trained in the United States, no longer knew what to do or how to do it. These ethnographers were unlikely to have even heard of *Notes and Queries*. If they had, they would consider it nothing more than an artifact of the era of cookbook ethnography with its lists of what an ethnographer should describe from measures of weight and time to string figures and tricks. Rather than being confident in their task, ethnographers of the 1980s and 1990s are fraught with worry about their biases and the limitations of fieldwork and ethnographic representation. In lieu of writing about cultures, they often write about their own position and biases. They are discomfited in the knowledge that