

the possibility to depart from a scholarship that has for the most part theorized masculinities across disciplines in the region, in relation to masculine bodies. Through this shift the chapters complicate the ways in which scholars have produced knowledge on masculinities in Mexico. The essays also effectively highlight the ways in which Mexican masculinities in the modern period mobilize local and global discourses and practices. For example, Macías-González' chapter "The Bathhouse and Male Homosexuality in Porfirian Mexico" illustrates how the creation of Mexican public bathhouses seek to modernize Mexico by encouraging standards of cleanliness that were largely perceived as European and North American. The governmental effort (unintentionally) provided a space that Mexican men used for erotic encounters. Overall, *Masculinity and Sexuality in Modern Mexico* provides a useful, accessible, and thought-provoking set of case studies on men and masculinities in the lives of ordinary people, movie stars, songwriters and officials in modern Mexico.

Anahi Russo Garrido  
Carleton College

**Gwendolyn Midlo Hall, ed. *A Black Communist in the Freedom Struggle: The Life of Harry Haywood* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012).**

Harry Haywood's autobiography *Black Bolshevik*, first published in 1978, was also a 700-page biography of the American Left. Haywood came to radical politics in 1919, supported nearly every liberation struggle of the 20th century, and died a dedicated Communist during Ronald Reagan's second term. His life companion and professional historian Gwendolyn Midlo Hall has condensed Haywood's capacious history into *A Black Communist in the Freedom Struggle*, a 325-page distillation of *Black Bolshevik* that helps to cement his legacy as a dynamo of revolutionary thought and action.

Haywood was born in 1898 in Omaha, Nebraska, to former slaves. His father was an admirer of Booker T. Washington. His mother, a domestic worker, would sing "The Ballad of Jesse James" while doing laundry. Haywood worked as a bootblack, porter, then dining-car waiter on the Chicago and Northwestern Railway before being radicalized by the Russian Revolution and 1919 race riots against Blacks in Chicago. By 1922, he had joined both the new Workers' (later Communist) Party and the more secretive Black Marxist organization the African Blood Brotherhood.

Haywood became a Bolshevik, he writes, because he saw 1917 as "part of a world revolutionary movement uniting Chinese, Africans, and Latin Americans with Europeans and North Americans" (101). He deepened this view after being sent by the Workers Party to study at the Bolshevik Universitet

Trydyashchiysya Vostoka Imeni Stalina (University of the Toilers of the East, or KUTVA). In Moscow, as a representative to the 1928 Comintern, he helped to develop the “Black Belt” thesis defining African Americans as an oppressed national minority and arguing for Black self-determination in the American south.

Fundamentally, Haywood never wavered from the Black Belt thesis in his political outlook or political work. He returned from the Soviet Union to the U.S. in 1930 and helped to organize the League of Struggle for Negro Rights while also working to build interracial trade unions in the American South, a Comintern directive. In 1936 he went to Spain convinced that the fight against fascism was both to save Bolshevism and to safeguard national liberation struggles worldwide. In 1948, he published his first book, *Negro Liberation*, a reassertion of the CPUSA’s commitment to Black self-determination after internal waverings and contortions during the Popular Front and World War II periods.

By 1956, Haywood felt the Party had abandoned Black liberation altogether. This period of his life is covered in a compressed 13 page “Epilogue” to the text. There, he writes retrospectively: “If the CPUSA hadn’t liquidated Communist work in the South and in the factories, the sixties would have seen a consolidated proletarian force emerge in the Black Belt and the ghettos. The Communist forces could have come out of the revolt with developed cadres rooted in the factories and communities, with credibility among the masses” (280). As Hall notes in her Introduction, Haywood along with some Black and Puerto Rican former CP members, formed the Provisional Organizing Committee to Reconstitute the Communist Party (POC) in New York City in 1958. By the 1960s, Haywood saw China’s revolution and Maoism as the vanguard of national self-determination struggles. As Hall notes, he also befriended and influenced members of the Marxist-nationalist Dodge Revolutionary Union Movement (DRUM) in Detroit before joining the Communist Party Marxist-Leninist in the 1970s. He later helped to develop the Maoist New Communist Movement in the U.S. before his death in 1985.

Hall justifies the editorial decision to truncate the post-World War II section of Haywood’s *Black Bolshevik* since the period was marked by “inner-party struggles and polemics, which are of little interest today except to specialists in Communist history” (xix). Since many of them are likely to be readers of Haywood’s book, this is a loss. As well, Haywood’s uncritical perspective on betrayals of Bolshevism by Stalin, and Mao’s distortions of Marxist thought are given no real critical interrogation in the text. This limits the opportunity for contemporary readers to assess Haywood’s body of thought as reflected in his other published work like *For a Revolutionary Position on the Negro Question*, now available on-line.

These slights, however, don’t detract from the benefit of making Haywood available again to a readership unlikely to have encountered *Black*

*Bolshevik* or unwilling to wade through its original bulk. Indeed, Haywood is along with W.E.B. Du Bois and Grace Lee Boggs one of the most important ‘hands-on’ guides to the U.S. Left’s political and ideological turns in the century just passed. Contemporary students of African American radicalism have a special responsibility to know his name. This book will help.

Bill V. Mullen  
Purdue University

**Julia Creet and Andreas Kitzmann, eds. *Memory and Migration: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Memory Studies* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010).**

In his 1997 critique of memory studies as an emerging field, Alon Confino warned of the narrow perspectives we develop when memory research focuses entirely on the political while neglecting the social; on representation with little attention to reception; and on asking questions about how memory manifests itself, without moving a step further and asking why. Drawing on sociologist Maurice Halbwachs’ seminal work contextualizing memory within its social contexts,<sup>1</sup> Confino argued for more nuance and complexity in studying collective memories and narratives:

To reject the separation of narratives assumes that historical actors participate in various processes at the same time, that they simultaneously represent, receive, and contest memory. To accept that none of these processes has primacy and yet to understand the meaning of memory, we need to understand all of them as intertwined—memory as a whole that is bigger than the sum of its parts.<sup>2</sup>

The challenge of how to study memory as “a whole that is bigger than the sum of its parts” still plagues the ever growing discipline of memory studies, because it necessitates being able to understand something as at once abstract and omnipresent as memory from multiple angles, through multiple frameworks. Memory is individual, social, political, and cultural at the same time. It is both internal and external. It is shaped by, and itself shapes, past, present, and future. It deals with notions of truth, subjectivity, and myth. As a result, memory studies has always been concerned with developing a multi- or inter-disciplinary—depending on who you ask—ethos and method, but just as with the wider scholarly turn towards multidisciplinary, there has been little consensus on what such a model should actually look like.

Julia Creet and Andreas Kitzmann’s edited collection, *Memory and Migration: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Memory Studies*, rises to meet this challenge by positing movement as an ideal framework for studying memory’s complexity and dynamic nature. In Creet’s introduction to the volume, she provocatively