

wartime morality play, not as an ideological move, or even a revisionist recovery, but because the brown bodies in question were in fact engaged in a dramatic struggle for dignity on the home front, one that called into question the dominant discourses of American democracy, liberty, and equality. By consistently comparing the East and West Coasts, by using examples from Texas, and by analyzing the so-called zoot suit riots of Los Angeles and Harlem along with those of Detroit and of the South, Alvarez inserts Mexican Americans and African Americans into the all-too-often nostalgic national narrative of the Depression-World War II “Greatest Generation.” The book therefore has the topical appeal and intellectual import to attract non-specialist academic readers, as well as those from a broader general audience interested in “interethnic cultural exchange,” “social relationships that value rather than denigrate difference,” and the power of “social spaces and cultural identities” (243).

Anthony Macías
University of California, Riverside

David H. Price, *Anthropological Intelligence: The Deployment and Neglect of American Anthropology in the Second World War* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008).

Contemporary anthropology shares some general awareness about the field’s professional contributions to the Second World War on the US side, but the actual range of US anthropologists’ engagement so far was not well understood. Most among anthropology’s active participants refrained from publishing about it in any detail after 1945. For the next generations of scholars, anthropology’s involvement in a just war against Nazism and fascism seemed to raise few questions, and thus merely attracted mild scholarly interest.

It took the new international contexts of the late Cold War era and of the present post-Cold War times, to bring that difference between general awareness and lack of actual knowledge and understanding back to scholars’ attention. Recent military challenges for contemporary anthropology, such as the US presence in Iraq since 2003 and the debate about scholars’ involvement in it, further contributed toward transforming that difference between awareness and knowledge into a new and timely research field: How did it all begin? What were the historical foundations of US anthropology’s involvement with the military, and which directions did it take?

David Price pursued these questions at first as one element within an important earlier project of his. When he researched the archives for his “Threatening Anthropology” volume (2004) about the FBI’s surveillance of activist anthropologists in the McCarthy era, he discovered that many scholars’ cooperation with intelligence and military services originated in the years before

1945. “World War Two anthropology unleashed something dangerous that was not easily contained.” (xiii)

One of this book’s great merits is the combination of meticulous documentation with lucid analysis. Price shows that more than half of US anthropologists contributed their professional expertise to the war effort, and how they did it. He covers their role in gathering and processing military intelligence, in the production of the Army’s regional Pocket Guide booklets, in teaching and training, in working for government agencies and for White House projects. Price documents professional organisations’ role in anthropology’s involvement with the US military, and he clarifies the particular weight of the Society for Applied Anthropology in it. The author thereby succeeds in presenting the first coherent and systematic overview of all major aspects in these encounters, and he traces individual projects which to this day hardly were known to the scholarly community. One key result from this side of Price’s analysis is a new understanding about the extent to which major research directions of US anthropology in fact had been promoted and developed through their cooperation with the military. They range from well-known cases such as studies in “culture and personality” and “national characters” to less well-known examples, such as the Human Relation Area Files.

Price’s critical analyses strive to assess the success and the failure, morally justifiable activities, cases of individual heroism as much as the unacceptable, the inhuman and the potentially dangerous elements in this record. A remarkable case of failure features the military’s neglect of the actual impact by anthropology-inspired propaganda leaflets upon the numbers of Japanese soldiers surrendering to the US army toward the end of the war: the rationale for this intentional neglect seems to have fed into preparations for dropping the nuclear bombs. Price’s limited list of success stories includes Ruth Benedict’s recommendation – based on the lessons she drew from British colonialism’s principle of “indirect rule” – to maintain the Japanese emperor in office after 1945. Cases of individual heroism included a failed OSS rescue operation led by British-born Gregory Bateson near Sumatra, attempting to save Indonesian operatives.

The list of activities which in Price’s presentist perspective rank as problematic, dubious, or outright unacceptable is not short. It includes Henry Field’s direction of the M-projects, in which one scheme (M-270) constructed Palestine as an uncultivated and barely populated area for Jewish resettlement schemes after the war. While M-270 became only one minor factor in the subsequent history of Palestine, anthropologists’ “Internment Fieldwork” for US authorities had more significant consequences. Carried out among those Japanese-Americans who were forcefully “relocated” into camps, it helped to stabilize an internment practice which already was criticized in its time. Only a few participating anthropologists, however, also voiced their critical doubts, such

as Marvin and Morris Opler. Price's assessments usually are balanced and careful, and much to his scholarly credit, they can be easily distinguished from his meticulous documentation. This provides the sound basis on which his academic readers may agree or disagree with him on individual points. In fact, one might find a few among the author's assessments of specific cases quite inappropriate. As problematic and unacceptable as US anthropologists' "Internment fieldwork" was, for instance, it still cannot be compared to the activities of Joseph Mengele in Auschwitz, who directly assisted in mass murder (170).

Price does not hide his deeply rooted skepticism about anthropology's multi-faceted engagement with the US war effort, and he makes his readers understand that this is based on his knowledge of where this engagement led to after 1945, during the Cold War. Although we may not agree with him on all analytical conclusions he draws, the scholarly community still has to be grateful for this impressive scholarly achievement. After all, it provides for the very first time a solid basis for a debate which has been long overdue. In all likelihood, this volume will remain the standard reference book for the years to come. It is an indispensable source of insights not only for anthropologists, who will gain a thoroughly new understanding about their own field's historical contexts of re-emergence after 1945. Moreover, this book provides ample material for historians of science in general, who sometimes tend to neglect the relevance of the social sciences and the humanities in armed conflict.

Andre Gingrich

Social Anthropology Research Unit, Austrian Academy of Sciences

Robert McAlmon, *The Nightingboulds of Paris*, ed. Sanford J. Smoller (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2007).

Robert McAlmon, bon vivant and minor American writer, died in 1956. *The Nightingboulds of Paris*, skilfully edited by Sanford J. Smoller, has, until now, languished unpublished in the Yale University archives. In a superb introduction to *Nightingboulds*, Smoller summarizes McAlmon's life and literary achievements: Midwestern upbringing; bisexuality; founding of Contact Press in 1923; marriage of convenience to Annie Winifred Ellerman, who preferred to be known by her literary pseudonym Bryher; relocation to Paris; alcohol consumption; repatriation to Phoenix, Arizona; posthumous reputation. Smoller's scholarship is impeccable and his prose style succinct. Unfortunately McAlmon does not write as well as Smoller does.

An account of bohemian life in Montparnasse from about 1928 until 1932, this book, partly novel and partly memoir, recalls Ernest Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises*, F. Scott Fitzgerald's *Tender is the Night*, John Glassco's *Memoirs of Montparnasse*, and Morley Callaghan's *That Summer in Paris*. Like these works,