

women's efforts are not always noted or acknowledged in the same degree as the sacrifices made by men. (177) This book begins the much needed foray into an under researched field, documenting, in their own words, the role of women in Islamic efforts to resist foreign domination. While there remains much ground to cover and many questions to answer, such as the extent to which Islam can provide an emancipatory framework for women when mosques "are still largely male preserves" and how different versions of Islam provide varying interpretations of women's role, this book challenges essentialist views of Muslim women as powerless victims by highlighting their agency. (60)

Maria Carter Hallward
American University, Washington D.C.

Jeffrey J. Williams, *How to be an Intellectual* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2014). 232 pp. \$27.00 Paperback.

In 1966, the famous conference on The Structuralist Controversy was held at Johns Hopkins. It set the terms of debate on virtually all aspects of cultural criticism for decades after; and many would see it as a fulcrum moment in the so-called theory wars that have shaped (and, for some, have contorted) the work of the intellectual ever since. However, as Jeffrey Williams reveals here, there is a much more fundamental observation to be made about that conference. It was part funded by a Ford Foundation grant, to the sum of \$30 000. The equivalent today would be over \$200 000. It is difficult to imagine, today, a world in which such a sum would be available for humanities.

Two things follow from this for Williams, in what is a remarkable book. First, we can have no serious understanding of the conditions of criticism or of the role of the intellectual in our times without attending to the fact that the arts and humanities have been systematically starved financially. The monetization of knowledge itself has formed, informed and deformed the position of the intellectual – and, equally important, it has affected the whole society within which the intellectual works. Second, the history shows that the intellectual has tended to turn inwards. Instead of making a confident address to wide social and political concerns, we have rather internalized those concerns, making them academic issues, or playing out their conflicts as merely debates in our own journals, often in a mode that is scholastic rather than scholarly. This second effect has also further distanced us from the people we are there to serve, that wider public. That intellectual deficit and funding deficit are related.

Notwithstanding this, Williams notes the persistent appetite for a re-energizing of our work. The linguistic turn of the 80s cedes place to a contemporary public turn. There is, indeed, an expanding interest in the function of our institutions, and a profound concern that we are not being permitted to operate as well as

we might. Part of the difficulty is that we need to find a new language and a new way of presenting our thinking. For Williams, this means what he calls “criticism without footnotes,” a hybrid form – in which this book is entirely written – between advanced and specialist critique and the immediacy of journalism. It works. The book has a seriousness whose reach is extended precisely because of how it is written.

How, then, should the intellectual be? Williams divides his chapters (typically four - five pages each) into four sections: “the politics of criticism”; “profiles in criticism”; “the predicament of the university”; and “the personal and the critical.” There is a structural logic to this. “The politics of criticism” describes some significant mainstream controversies in literary and cultural studies (with brilliant pieces on the theory journal, the rise of the ‘smart’ critic, and a superb reflection on the ubiquity of culture). “Profiles” examines how around a dozen influential individuals have negotiated the broad political terrain on which criticism has developed. This groundwork allows a consideration of how our universities operate (super chapters on debt and indenture, and on the cultural image of the academy); and finally Williams can re-describe his own life and career. At the center of this is the relation between the academic and the citizen; and Williams is clear that there has to be some intimacy between what we say in our writings and how we live our lives. Criticism, here, is close to activism.

Chapter one revisits the critical exchange between Richard Rorty and Andrew Ross in *Dissent*, 1991-92. This was the first moment in what became Rorty’s insistent refrain that while the “academic left” (a descriptor Williams dislikes) became caught up in self-important debates around theory inside the academy, in the streets outside, the rest of America was being screwed. Ross was one of his targets. Ross responded by pointing out that Rorty simply did not understand popular cultural forms, nor did he understand their importance. Yet, essentially, both participants were fundamentally on the same political side. They just differed in strategies and emphases. Neither was a bad guy.

Williams outlines this in detail and with acuity. But the question remains: who, then, were the bad guys? The debate actually exemplified Rorty’s point: while the left argued with itself, the bad guys just kept rolling along, damaging universities and humanities through the primacy given to market-fundamentalism and profit. There is a further dimension to this, much less discussed by Williams; and that is how the bad guys have changed the very nature and public understanding of what we do through a much softer tactic. The prevailing language in which we understand ourselves as human and social beings has itself changed: all human activity — including that of the intellectual — is now primarily understood in terms of management. If something is not managed, it is not comprehensible. Williams could say more on the primacy of this massive cultural shift; and he is the person to do it, given how well he traces an entire historical trajectory of cultural shifts here. Moreover, he can do so precisely by simultaneously changing the language itself in which

we describe how to be an intellectual.

This is a book full of shrewd insights, illuminating and suggestive histories of how the intellectual has been and could be. The criticism without footnotes approach helps bring the crucial questions into a much clearer and open light than is usual. In short, it helps to *make* its reader an intellectual. This is a vital and necessary book.

Thomas Docherty
University of Warwick, UK

Phillip Deery, *Red Apple: Communism and McCarthyism in Cold War New York* (New York, Empire State Editions, 2014). 268 pp. \$34.95 Paperback.

When novelist Norman Mailer and columnist Jimmy Breslin ran as a team in the Democratic primary for the top two elective posts in New York City in 1969, it seemed (all too briefly) that “The Big Apple” was finally emerging from two decades of being mired in the muck of the McCarthy Era. Their campaign slogan was as brash and brusque as the two candidates themselves: “No More Bullshit!” But even more turbulent politics that year overwhelmed their libertarian platform. They finished fourth out of five in the primary, and former Republican John Lindsay ultimately swept to mayoral re-election victory as a maverick Fusion-Independent. McCarthyism was indeed a spent force halfway through the Cold War, but its legacy was all too evident in the broken lives and crushed careers of many prominent residents of (or visitors to) what only later was called “Fun City.”

Phillip Deery’s *Red Apple: Communism and McCarthyism in Cold War New York* is a welcome reminder that the reactionary-inspired, fear-based politics of six decades ago can be a salutary subject to consider in 2015. He chose NYC because in the aftermath of WWII it “became a crucible in which the politics of the Cold War was fought with bitterness and intensity.” (2) This was in part because NYC “was the epicenter of the American Communist Party [CPUSA]” and in part because “it was also a bastion, and had long been so, of left-wing liberalism.” (3-4) With the exception of Washington, DC, there were more spies and counter-spies, government agents, subversives, and defectors (from both sides) operating in NYC than in any other city in the US. It is therefore worth noting that *not one* of the six individuals singled out by Deery in *Red Apple* falls into any of those categories.

He is well aware that these six represent many more: Edward Barsky was a medical doctor, Howard Fast a journalist and popular novelist, O. John Rogge a lawyer, Dimitri Shostakovich a composer, and two—Lyman Bradley and Edwin Burgum—were academics. Deery’s selectivity operated on a number of levels: his candidates for inclusion had to be either resident in, or connected to events in, NYC during the early post-WWII era. Three of the six experienced *permanent* Cold War career casualties; three others enjoyed rehabilitation. Although the “*Red Apple Six*”