Quark 15.2draft FINISHED.qxd 11/21/11 2:50 PM Page 157

practice" (22) by young people in which they use arts and writing to critique social conditions. He argues that critical practice can help transcend both games, resulting in less investment in constructed gender roles. In so doing, he suggests that art and scholarship should have an activist orientation and can achieve real-world changes. As a successful example of critical practice, he cites Harmony, a young woman who was released from the RITS and returned as a teacher. Anthony, the most frequently discussed example in the book, also represents critical practice, contributing insightful material to *Hidden TREWTH* and working for the Broad Street Studio upon his release. Yet at least implicitly, Anthony also represents the limitations of critical practice: he fled Rhode Island after becoming a suspect in a burglary of the Broad Street Studio and a murder.

This book is thought provoking, but not entirely successful. Reich's analysis is most compelling when he focuses on the Game of Outlaw and how young people use the game to achieve their visions of masculinity, even though some are aware of the artificiality of the exercise. The analysis is somewhat less compelling when dealing with the Game of Law. Reich is not entirely clear on whether the Game of Law is a means of fitting into society generally or merely an adaptation to the artificial circumstances of the RITS. In addition, Reich's advocacy of an activist role for art and scholarship might be off-putting for readers who do not share this view. These reservations aside, *Hidden Truth* is still a compelling read and a compelling analysis of why young people involved with crime do what they do.

David B. Wolcott
Newtown, PA

Peter D. Norton, *Fighting Traffic: The Dawn of the Motor Age in the American City* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2008).

If I walk across the middle of a busy city street, there is a good chance that a car will hit me. And chances are that motorists will call me a jaywalker, or something worse. Onlookers might question why I risked my life by refusing to cross at a nearby pedestrian crosswalk. City streets, after all, belong to motorized vehicles, not other uses. *Fighting Traffic: The Dawn of the Motor Age in the American City* uncovers the emergence of this dominant conception of the street over eight decades ago.

Fighting Traffic examines the ways in which automobile interests, known as "motordom," reconceptualized the American city street as a car thoroughfare and delegitimated other uses that had enjoyed customary rights. The shift was not inevitable; rather, it was a "violent revolution" (2) that reached its height in the 1920s. Norton employs a social constructivist framework to study the city

Quark 15.2draft FINISHED.qxd 11/21/11 2:50 PM Page 158

street as a technological artifact that was contested by various social groups who employed "technological frames" (4) to promote different uses. Pedestrians interpreted the street through "justice," which emphasized the dangers that automobiles posed to other street users. This conception placed responsibility on motorists for maiming innocent pedestrians. Traffic engineers understood the street as a public utility and a site of "efficiency." They sought to regulate its use based on utilitarian principles that often restricted automobiles. Both of these technological frames threatened the automobile's growth by the mid 1920s, and motordom responded by constructing the street as a commodity through the frame of "freedom." Strong associations of political and economic freedom with American society, along with motordom's growing financial and organizational resources, ensured that its interpretation emerged dominant.

Most studies on the growth of urban automobility during the early twentieth century are based on a misleading dichotomy between the car and the street railway. Proponents of the "consumer-demand school" believe that the automobile was technologically superior to other modes, hence users inevitably abandoned the streetcar and jumped at the chance to become motorists. The "elite-imposition school," in contrast, asserts that the automobile, rubber, and gasoline industries conspired to eliminate streetcars, deconcentrate populations, and force urbanites to purchase automobiles. Norton argues that "[t]here were far more participants in this contest [for the street] than motorists, automobile manufacturers, street railways, and city planners," (16) including merchants, police, engineers, and parents. Because he concentrates on changing meanings of the street - and not only the automobile's replacement of the streetcar – Norton is able to analyze the complexities of these competing and sometimes overlapping interests.

Focusing on the street also enables Norton to show that pedestrians are essential to the history of urban mobility. In particular, *Fighting Traffic* examines the threat pedestrian safety posed to motordom. Automobile interests sought to place part of the onus on pedestrians themselves. Motordom crafted educational campaigns that taught pedestrians to have concern for their own safety, in order to transfer responsibility onto them. The book includes a fascinating discussion on the shifting meaning of "jaywalker" as a rhetorical example of the broader shift. The term had referred to walkers who blocked the path of others (including pedestrians), but by the mid 1920s, motordom had altered in meaning to refer to pedestrians who interfered with car movement.

Norton emphasizes that the 1923-1924 slump in car sales motivated the automobile industry to reconceptualize the city street. Historians have argued that concern over consumer demand in the 1920s motivated the industry to implement annual model changes, financing plans, and more advertising. *Fighting Traffic* shows that motordom also understood the slump as a problem of supply: a lack of "floor space" (155) on city streets for the growing number of automo-

Quark 15.2draft FINISHED.qxd 11/21/11 2:50 PM Page 159

biles. Increasingly consolidated through mergers, motordom emerged from the slump united and ready to redefine the street.

Highlighting the 1920s means that Norton understates earlier conflict between new technologies and customary street uses. During the late nineteenth century, municipalities promoted conceptions of the street as an artery over other uses when they permitted streetcars to run along city thoroughfares. Electric streetcars also threatened the safety of pedestrians. Although the dramatic increase of automobiles during the 1920s created new problems and escalated old ones, the decade's fight for the street witnessed significant continuities with earlier battles between mechanized transport and other street uses.

Fighting Traffic shows how historians can integrate theory – in this case, the social construction of technology – as a means to conceptualize their empirical studies. By focusing on the street as a technological artifact and the social groups that competed to define its uses, Norton has admirably contributed to the debate on the car's dominance in American cities, a historical process with ramifications on current attempts to reduce automobile use. The next time I cross the street, I'll walk hesitantly and think of the past.

Jay Young
York University