BOOK REVIEWS


Reviewed by Christian Gonzales, Department of History, University of California, San Diego.

With this book Richard Carrico has provided an accessible general history of San Diego County’s Native American peoples. This second edition includes new chapters focused on the period between 1880 and 1935. The wider chronological span allows Carrico to relate a more complete history that culminates with the resurgence of native communities in the twentieth century. In the opening chapter, Carrico uses archaeological data to reach far into pre-history and reconstruct native economies and social organization. The remainder of the volume follows the complicated story that unfolded as native and Euro-Americans confronted each other in San Diego. Carrico explores native relations with Missions San Diego and San Luis Rey, native social and economic change during the Mexican period, and native attempts to preserve lands after the United States took possession of California in 1848. Though he gives attention to many groups including Spanish and Mexican authorities, the Cahuilla, and the Cupeños, his greatest focus is on Kumeyaay and Luiseño relations with Americans.

Carrico argues that the Kumeyaay, Luiseños, Cupeños, and Cahuillas have maintained distinct identities and communities despite the historical experience of social marginalization and land loss. Through “revolt, appeasement, and cooperation” (p. x), natives negotiated and survived the onslaught of the Spanish, Mexicans, and Americans. Carrico explains that the mission system “sowed the seeds of destruction” through the disruption of native economies and the dislocation of Indian villages. The ensuing Mexican period further circumscribed native economic patterns, while the American era witnessed more intense attempts by California politicians and local Anglos to dispossess and disenfranchise Indians. Moreover, Carrico contends that through ineptitude and what he calls “benign neglect” the federal government abetted Indian land loss.

Indians, however, fought or accommodated the forces arrayed against them. Carrico shows that the 1775 Mission San Diego revolt, nineteenth-century Indian labor patterns, native leaders’ long struggles to secure reservations and native land titles, and the rise of Indian casinos in the twentieth century represent important manifestations of native agency. His endeavor to recount how Indians adapted to the destructive forces they faced captures well the perspectives of historic native peoples, and pays respect to the claims of contemporary San Diego County natives that they have a unique and important history.

Indeed, the most engaging parts of the book illuminate the historical actions of native people. Especially important are the discussions that reveal the varied strategies Indians employed to secure land rights and negotiate the upheavals caused by removal. For example, the San Pascual Kumeyaay leader Panto worked tirelessly from the mid 1830s to the early 1870s to defend Indian lands. He negotiated with Mexican officials and “met with a constant parade of American officials”

Reviewed by Robert J. Chandler, Senior Research Historian, Wells Fargo Bank.

Barbara Voss, a Stanford professor, used thirteen years’ experience digging up the Presidio of San Francisco to illustrate how “archeology provides a broader and more inclusive perspective on the emergence of Californio identity” (p. 111). Studied analysis of human refuse brings “a persistent focus” and “long-term perspective on social life” (p. 121). Voss is the first scholar to be “substantively engaged with presidios as institutional sites for the cultural negotiation of colonial social identity” (p. 112). Her thesis is easily summarized: the evolution of the culture of the Presidio of San Francisco from 1776 to 1821 was a “transition from casta to Californio” (p. 7). That is, the settlers rose from the bottom of a racially-ranked society in Northern Mexico to become “People of Reason” in Alta California.

Captain Juan Bautista de Anza recruited settlers for Alta California mostly
from around Culiacán, Sinaloa, and Fuerte, Sonora, areas suffering from crop failures and Indian attack. Families making the long overland trek averaged four children, for the colony needed to perpetuate itself. On July 26, 1776, 193 men, women, children (about twice the number on the Mayflower in 1620) arrived at the bleak Presidio site, recently cleared of local inhabitants by intertribal war. The troops immediately set to work “to secure indigenous lands as colonized space” in an area surrounded by Indians (p. 147). Not surprisingly, securing these lands and establishing domination over local Native Americans involved exploitative labor relations, the creation of fortified spaces, and both the threat and practice of physical violence. “Colonial ethnogenesis,” Voss astutely observes, “can be understood only within this context of intercultural interaction, exploitation, and violence” (p. 47).

Furthermore, Voss perceptively notes, “the military settlers shaped a new land for themselves and shaped themselves to fit this new land” (p. 147). The first adjustment by these people of mixed Mexican Indian, African, and European heritage was to abandon the casta system that fixed social rank through an elaborate system of racial composure. When asked, settlers gave themselves better parental antecedents and after twenty years, ignored the stratifications altogether. Casta had no meaning in a small, isolated population. In place of the system of casta, the colonizing population created a new identity through everyday practices like building styles, fashion, and cuisine. In each of these instances, non-Indian residents of the presidio created a material culture that indicated their distinction from, as well as their domination over, the indigenous population.

Indeed, the material artifacts of presidio life reveal the emergence of a Californio identity while pointing to how Indians were marginalized through the process of ethnogenesis. “Each body of archeological evidence examined in this study,” Voss declares, “must be considered in light of the substantial number of paid, impressed, and captive Native Californians upon whose labor the colonists depended” (p. 82). Through the eighteenth century, it appears, ten Indians were always at work around the quadrangle, while in the nineteenth century, their numbers grew to thirty. Yet, colonists did not house these laborers among them, for Indians had been no friends in Mexico. Only ten of the 465,000 artifacts found were Indian.

In the third chapter, Voss details population but neglects to apply these numbers when analyzing artifacts. From 1776 to 1821, the Presidio of San Francisco averaged 140 people (half of whom were children) divided into 40 households, including thirty soldiers. Her generalized conclusions, therefore, rest on only seventy adults, and probably fewer. Two thirds of the troops were always away on detached duty, leaving women, who were without formal political power or military rank, in the majority.

The nature of this population invites questions. Captain Anza’s frontier soldiers began life as uneducated rural farmers and ranchers, not artisans. They were good at what they knew, but not at creating material culture. The Presidio went through three enlargements of the quadrangle, but due to poor clay from the site and lack of building skills, each adobe wall stood for only a few years. Homemade pottery exhibits the same low quality. For clothing, dishes, tools, and some food, the small colony depended on supply ships from Mexico. Their material culture came to them.
Throughout this study, Barbara Voss’s skill with archeological material leads to perceptive interpretations from a scanty record. Her ceramic and food analyses are keen, as is her “Landscape Portrait” (pp. 163-170) of Juana Briones, the subject of Jeanne McDonnell’s 2008 biography. Voss’s survey of anthropological ideology makes *The Archeology of Ethnogenesis* valuable as a class text, but for the general reader, John P. Langelier and Daniel B. Rosen’s 1996 history of the Presidio is a good adjunct.


Reviewed by Lawrence E. Babits, Professor and Director of Program in Maritime Studies, East Carolina University.

*Gold Rush Port* is an important text with the potential for classroom use. James Delgado effectively blends a theoretical approach and explanation while relating history and how historians have viewed the maritime world. In the process, he also shows how to manage cultural resources in an urban setting. Delgado explicitly sees the ocean as the connection between points, not as a barrier. Thus, for Gold Rush San Francisco, the ocean is what made the port city possible. Given the length and irregularity of overland transportation in 1849, the regularity and predictability of rapid oceanic transport was the key to creating a worldwide network of suppliers and consumers linked to San Francisco. Delgado tests his assumptions against the Klondike gold rush town, Dawson City, which did not succeed as an entrepot, in large measure because it was not directly connected to the sea but was at the end of a long, intermittent route that ultimately caused it to wither. This concept that the ocean facilitates communication and is not an obstruction is one that many so-called maritime historians do not grasp. They need to read what Delgado has to say in his first three chapters.

Delgado sets standards to guide development of any waterfront or harbor. The failures and successes of development and historical/archaeological preservation are related without blame or hysteria in Chapter 6. His arguments make sense without attributing present shortcomings to past developments. Delgado’s theoretical premises are backed up by solid archaeological information derived from over thirty years of intermittent, site specific archaeology that he weaves together into a concrete, easily understood whole relating to San Francisco’s first ten years (1848-1858).

The text concentrates on four sites, the *Niantic*, the *General Harrison*, the Hoff Store, and Sansome Street. The *Niantic* was utilized as a storeship, then abandoned, and then “rediscovered” several times because planners repeatedly assumed that prior construction activity had destroyed the vessel. Here is an object lesson for non-archaeologists to consider when approving development without first testing the site.

The Hoff Store was on pilings adjacent to another storeship. The store burned in a catastrophic fire on 4 May 1851, and the resultant burial of the site sealed its contents for late twentieth century archaeologists to compare with the documen-
tary records. It was somewhat remarkable for its “stratigraphic and/or contextual integrity” (p. 129). Tightly dated to 1849-51, the site demonstrated the transformation to an urban center.

The third site was 343 Sansome Street, another structure associated with the 4 May 1851 fire. It was buried and then buried deeper under 1906 earthquake debris. Spatial distributions within the site allowed interpretation of storage areas, living quarters, and sales zones within the store.

The **General Harrison** was another storeship excavated in 2001. Not all the site could be excavated because it extended onto other property where mitigation of impact was not possible. There was mixing of materials from the 1851 and 1906 catastrophes in some places. A variety of excavation techniques were necessary due to the wet soil that created such good preservation. Comparing archaeological finds with newspaper advertisements made it possible to show how diverse the cargo points of origin were, demonstrating the connections San Francisco had to the wider maritime world.

Even though he concentrated on only four sites, Delgado has brought the waterfront back to life and given the artifacts a real context, the maritime world of mid-nineteenth century San Francisco. The final chapter is a very good summary of what was presented in the text and reinforces points made throughout.

Appendix 3 is an important addition that contains eleven pages of “reconstructed” cargo stored aboard the **General Harrison** from 1849 to 1851. This supports Delgado’s interpretation that the merchants brought in essential goods, such as food, clothing, and building materials, in great quantity, while alcohol and other luxuries were present in much smaller quantities. From this sort of data, Delgado shows that the merchants were working to establish a strong, or perhaps steady, economy, rather than going for a quick profit.

It is interesting that Delgado did not explore the types of ships that became storeships, although he did provide a listing of the age, size, and construction site for 104 of these vessels. Of the 86 vessels counted under construction date, 80 (90%) were built in 1840 or earlier, indicating that they were probably at the end of their active sailing careers. It is just as telling that only 7 vessels were built in 1820 or earlier, showing something of the age of vessels rounding the Horn.

The book will stand the test of time, both as history and as a guide for managing resources. It also deserves a place in the classroom for showing students the richness of harbor environments.

---


Reviewed by Benjamin R. Jordan, Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of History and Political Science, Christian Brothers University.

The typical biography of John Muir has focused on his wilderness wanderings, nature writings, and Yosemite National Park activism. By contrast, Donald Worster’s balanced examination of his long life sets the preservation champion...
within the revealing context of Muir’s other three careers. First, young John was a promising and diligent inventor and engineer. His niche was improving efficiency in machines at lumber mills. Second, Muir’s desire to design machines and understand how they functioned paralleled his scientific study of nature’s inner workings via the disciplines of botany and geology (particularly glaciology). A scientist-engineer’s mindset and the need to support his many nature expeditions, writing projects, and wife and two daughters drove Muir’s third career as capitalist farmer. John married into a prospering farm family and spent much of his adult life expertly and scientifically managing a large fruit-exporting ranch in California. Worster demonstrates that Muir did not in principle oppose – and in many ways facilitated and depended on – industrialization, technology, capitalist agriculture, and human development of natural resources.

Worster’s primary arguments are that “Muir was a liberal, a democrat, and a conservationist,” and that liberal democracy, human rights, personal liberty, and social equality infused the nature conservation movement that Muir helped inspire (p. 6). The author provides convincing evidence that Muir can be called a liberal in terms of being open to new ideas or reforms – such as his belief that nature was benign and constantly changing beyond human control. Moreover, Muir’s criticisms of “commercialism” and his efforts to reform a modernizing society through government intervention shared much in common with other liberal reformers of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era.

Worster argues that Muir did not fit neatly into either the preservation (which the author curiously and narrowly defines as “non-use of resources”) or conservation (“wise use of resources”) camp, but Worster generally refers to him as a conservationist (p. 308). What tied him to other conservationists of the period was their mutual rejection of wasteful or excessive exploitation of natural resources. Muir departed from many but not all fellow conservation travelers in stressing that nature was a spiritual and mental resource for humans as much as a source of material wealth, and that plants and animals had human-like awareness and emotions that undergirded their independent right to exist and thrive. Worster insists that Muir, contrary to popular belief, never defined wilderness as a pristine place with no trace of human presence. Muir’s affinity for “extraordinary” landscapes in which an over-civilized person could spiritually and mentally regenerate himself by studying nature’s beautiful transformations and his gradual rejection of ranching and dam-building in Yosemite National Park, though, complicate Worster’s claim. William Rollins’ explanation of “modernist” environmental activists who preferred clearly demarcated wilderness and civilized areas seems to fit Muir more than does William Cronon’s call for a wilderness that incorporates human labor.

Worster, in this reader’s opinion, too willingly defines Muir’s nature philosophy as being egalitarian or concerned with social equality. Worster does point out that Muir (worth a surprising four million present-day dollars at his death) failed to express awareness and criticism of the effects of capitalism, imperialism, and early globalization on the environment. Muir seemed most comfortable mingling with America’s rich and powerful capitalists, politicians, and intellectuals. Muir was less racist and sexist than the typical white man of his era; however, he rarely got his hands dirty fighting for the rights of women or the African Americans or Native Americans he encountered. Worster occasionally
cites key feminist and critical race studies perspectives on environmental history, but he fails to fully utilize them to rethink his characterizations of Muir and the conservation movement. Carolyn Merchant’s *Death of Nature* and Vera Norwood’s *Made from this Earth: American Women and Nature*, missing from Worster’s bibliography, could shed intriguing feminist light on Muir’s scientific view of nature. The cited works of David Spence, Karl Jacoby, and Kevin DeLuca and Anne Demo suggest that Muir’s efforts to set aside extraordinary (formerly Native American) landscapes for the benefit of better-off park visitors was not really egalitarian or focused on “the pulling down of so many oppressive hierarchies that once plagued the world” (pp. 417 and 465). Current environmental justice activists might well consider Muir to be a villain as much as a hero.

Worster’s biography is too long for undergraduates, but environmental historians and graduate students will profit from its fuller picture of Muir’s life and nature beliefs. The general reader will be enticed by Worster’s captivating narrative, which reads delightfully like a grand adventure through a range of distinct landscapes in the genre of Muir’s hero, Alexander von Humboldt. Feminist scholars and historians who focus on issues of race, though, may be left with the impression that Muir and his impacts on modern environmentalism remain elusive.


Reviewed by Theodore A. Strathman, Lecturer, Department of History, University of San Diego.

Scholars and lay readers who wish to understand the politics of the Colorado River and the historical origins of today’s water crises will welcome the new edition of Norris Hundley’s *Water and the West*. Hundley’s work is one of the founding texts of western water historiography and preceded by a decade important works like Donald Worster’s *Rivers of Empire* and Marc Reisner’s *Cadillac Desert*. This second edition features a new preface and epilogue that help place Hundley’s original work in the context of recent developments in western water politics.

The focal point of this book is the Colorado River Compact, the 1922 agreement among representatives of the seven states in the river’s drainage basin. Hundley describes the compact as the product of negotiations among a wide range of parties who recognized that interstate cooperation and compromise were necessary given competing interests and the uncertainties of western water law. Since the development of the river involved national, state, and local governments, one of Hundley’s key themes is the complex workings of federalism. While the compact has served as a model for other multi-party treaties, Hundley notes that the 1922 agreement could not prevent years of litigation and controversy that have continued to the present. One of the major problems with the
compact, he argues, is that its drafters believed that haste was necessary. Thus they based their allocations of water on incomplete data that proved to be inaccurate.

Drawing on an impressive array of primary sources, Hundley expertly traces the development of the key debates over the allocation of water. Several interests converged to promote the development of the river. Imperial Valley farmers, Reclamation Service engineers, private power companies, and Los Angeles city officials were among the earliest advocates. Meanwhile, upper basin states like Utah and Wyoming worried that California, given its large population and advanced economy, would utilize the lion’s share of the river’s flow before the less developed states could begin significant diversions. Upper basin states feared that the doctrine of prior appropriation ("first in time, first in right") could effectively shut them out of significant Colorado water rights.

These factors helped inspire the idea for a compact among the basin states. Delegates failed to agree on how to divide the Colorado’s water until they broke the impasse by splitting the basin into two sections and apportioning water to each of these instead of making allocations to individual states. As Hundley notes, though, triumph for the delegates remained elusive, as ratification by the states proved to be more difficult than they had anticipated. The 1928 Boulder Canyon Act sidestepped Arizona’s continued reluctance to approve the agreement by allowing ratification of the compact by only six states, but conflict would continue in the courts for nearly forty years.

The new epilogue explores a number of developments in the Colorado River Basin since the 1960s. According to Hundley, by that time it was clear that the compact could not provide for unrestricted development in the basin. This reality was rendered even more apparent by the 1990s, when new data cast doubt on whether basin states could rely on their previous estimates of river flow. Furthermore, global warming threatens western water supplies. Such developments helped inspire agreements in 2007 among basin states that would allow the upper basin to release less water to the lower basin during periods of drought, thus suggesting that Arizona, California, and Nevada will have to “share the discomfort of water shortages” in the future (p. 313). Increasing pressures on Colorado River users have also led to conservation measures and the drive for water transfers. As Hundley observes, the long history of struggles over the Colorado suggests that any efforts to pursue new sources or renegotiate agreements of allocation are likely to involve decades of bargaining and litigation.

Hundley’s book is indispensible for those who wish to understand the complex legal and political foundation of Colorado River water usage. Some readers may find that Hundley’s book is overly celebratory of the development of water resources. While he does acknowledge that “perhaps too many” (p. xv) dams have been built on the Colorado and that water projects do bring environmental costs, the book does not seem to thoroughly question the perspective of its protagonists that development of the river was fundamentally good. Critics of urban and suburban development in the West (and those who find value in the region’s arid landscapes) may cringe at Hundley’s choice of words when he concludes that a “great deal of the West has been condemned to remain a desert” (p. x). This reservation aside, Water in the West still stands as an excellent piece of political history.

Reviewed by Robert W. Cherny, Professor of History, San Francisco State University.

Jesse Unruh was one of the most powerful forces in post-World War II California politics, a larger-than-life figure who transformed both the speakership of the state assembly and the legislature itself. Raised in poverty on a Texas sharecropper cotton farm, he used the GI Bill after the Second World War to acquire an education and then began a lifetime in politics, running unsuccessfully for the California assembly twice before gaining election in 1954. He became chair of the Committee on Finance in his second term, chair of the powerful Ways and Means Committee during his third term, and speaker in his fourth term, serving from 1961 to 1969. He lost elections for governor in 1970 and for mayor of Los Angeles in 1973, then was elected as state treasurer in 1974 and reelected until his death in 1987. During his heyday as speaker, he was undeniably the most powerful figure in the state next to the governor, which was as Unruh thought it should be.

Bill Boyarsky reported on state politics for the AP and for the Los Angeles Times beginning in 1961, just as Unruh began his tenure as speaker. His biography of Unruh is based in significant part on his own experiences with Unruh and the legislature, and on the experiences of others he knew as a Sacramento reporter, as well as research in the archives and interviews with participants. In a few places, the book reads more like a memoir than a typical biography.

Boyarsky gives us a good picture of this complex personality. Unruh's drive for power, according to Boyarsky, was fueled by an anger that was always near the surface, an anger over social injustice that went back to his poverty-stricken childhood. His commitment to social justice was coupled with a willingness to use government to solve society's problems, an attitude typical of many in the generation that came to political maturity during the New Deal and Second World War. To address social injustice, Unruh sought power, and he built a political organization that provided a model for later speakers. Before today's stringent reporting laws for political contributions, Unruh and his close associates collected large sums from lobbyists and interest groups and used it to support campaigns for the assembly so that many – probably the large majority – of the assembly's Democrats owed Unruh a political debt. His anger over social injustice led to such measures as the Unruh Civil Rights Act and the Lanterman-Petris-Short Act, which transformed the state's role in commitment and care procedures for the mentally ill. His commitment to the role of the legislature in policy-making led to the creation of the full-time legislature with adequate pay and an adequate and professional staff. Under his leadership, legislative hearings became important ways of securing information to guide policy formation.

At the same time, Unruh was thin-skinned, never forgetting what he considered a slight, and given to snap decisions, some of which he later regretted. He was probably an alcoholic and definitely a womanizer at a time when the press did not pay much attention to such behavior. Always a political moderate, he anticipated that the Rumford Act would alienate working-class, white Democrats. As a centrist and cold warrior, he had little use for the liberals of the California Democratic

Boyarsky’s approach gives the book an episodic character that occasionally leaves important questions unanswered. Chapter 5 deals with Unruh’s first term as an assembly member and provides a revealing picture of the nature of life for state legislators at that time – poorly paid, living away from their families, dependent on lobbyists for free meals and drinks, with lots of late-night carousing. In the next chapter, we read about the Unruh civil rights bill of 1959, when Unruh used his considerable power as chair of the Ways and Means Committee to push through the legislation – but we learn nothing about how Unruh gained that important committee position. The following chapter jumps to the Rumford Fair Housing Act of 1963, by which time Unruh was in his second term as speaker. Again, we learn nothing about how Unruh garnered the votes to put him into the speaker’s chair. This, however, is my most serious criticism of the book. Overall, it presents a well rounded and thoughtful portrait of one of California’s most important political figures of the past half-century and of the political world in which he operated.


Reviewed by Louise Nelson Dyble, Assistant Professor, Department of Social Sciences, Michigan Technological University.

With this exploration of three important suburban communities, Ann Forsyth has made a significant contribution to urban history and the history of planning. Her analysis of Irvine, California, Columbia, Maryland, and The Woodlands, Texas also provides a challenging and provocative resource for planning professionals, developers, and policy-makers. While her very sympathetic portrayal of these ambitious undertakings will no doubt inspire controversy, her insights and opinions are impeccably informed by thorough and thoughtful research.

Forsyth explores one of the rarest and most revealing of twentieth-century development enterprises: the wholesale creation of an entirely new community. These communities are the products of the “New Town” movement that emerged in a brief interlude during the 1960s when federal incentives, private investment capital, and cutting-edge planning theory converged. They were self-conscious efforts to design places accommodating all the needs of a community, from housing, to jobs, to commerce and recreation – and to do so in a way that countered the negative associations with “sprawl.”

While Forsyth provides the reader with a solid account of the historical context and precedents that informed these communities, she focuses her efforts on detailing their conception and execution. With sensitivity to the complexities of business administration and local politics, her book affords the reader with a view of the long process of negotiation and adaptation involved in large-scale development. In the process, she paints vivid and compelling portraits not only of the celebrated visionaries at the helm of these complex undertakings, but also
the crew who actually navigated the course toward their realization.

Irvine Ranch is the largest of the three communities that Forsyth studies, and its development also has the deepest historical roots. The transition of the ranch from a profitable agricultural enterprise to an ambitious “new community” and eventually the heart of a major city involved a wide variety of public and private agencies and institutions. The Irvine Foundation, formed in 1937, helped preserve the size of the holding even as public infrastructure investments made it highly desirable for development; Forsyth remarks that it “certainly would have developed eventually” (p. 61). When the Irvine Company (owned by the Foundation) hired architects William Pereira and Associates in 1959 and began developing designs for development in conjunction with ongoing plans for a new University of California campus, that eventuality became imminent. However, it was what happened after the decision to develop the property that is most interesting. Forsyth effectively portrays the stunning complexity of decision-making, from the initial planning in the 1960s to the marketing and construction of the early housing and facilities in the 1970s (“the place where urban sprawl ends”), to the sale of the company in 1977 and the diffusion of control over Irvine’s planning in the late 1980s. Tax policy and environmental regulations; local political and governmental developments; outside industrial and business interests; ideology—“transformation in perceptions of the land” (p. 99); and the personalities of the company’s constantly shifting leadership all significantly shaped the form and function of Irvine over time.

Forsyth traces the development of Columbia and The Woodlands in just as much detail. Columbia was the pet project of James Rouse, one of the most influential and successful commercial developers of the late twentieth century. Columbia reflected his personal dedication to the project and willingness to sacrifice profitability for the sake of its integrity as a planned community with social as well as economic purposes. The Woodlands, developed by oil mogul George Mitchell, was the most environmentally oriented of the three, designed to reconcile development with the sensitive ecology of an important natural watershed. It reflected the ideas of Ian McHarg, just one among several important thinkers who play a role in Forsyth’s story. The Woodlands also manifested some of the core evolving principles of environmental planning and landscape architecture.

At one level, Forsyth’s account of compromise and contingency in the process of development seems to belie her claim that these new communities represent coherent manifestations of planning and design. In particular, the reader wonders if the role of government, particularly in providing crucial infrastructure (especially highways), does not deserve more consideration. Yet in the end her argument is persuasive; while never fully or perfectly realized, the success of these communities does represent important evidence for the power of private sector initiative and comprehensive planning. Forsyth’s conclusions are hopeful: she portrays these new communities as the products of farsighted pioneers who contributed significantly to the goal of achieving more sustainable and livable suburbs and reining in the chaos of sprawl.

This is a challenging and dense book that is best appreciated by a reader already familiar with post-World War II suburban development and planning. It might have benefited from a judicious abridgement. Still, time invested in a close reading will pay off. The book is guaranteed to inspire heated discussion in graduate seminars and offers many thought-provoking insights to planning
and development professionals as well as urbanists across disciplines. Intrepid Southern California readers, most of whom deal with both the advantages and disadvantages of suburban communities on a daily basis, will find the ideas that inform them and the story of their conception and execution fascinating as well.

**BOOK NOTES**

*The California Deserts: An Ecological Rediscovery.* By Bruce M. Pavlik. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008. xii + 365 pp. Illustrations, maps, charts, tables, bibliography, index. $27.50, paper. This volume explores the ecology of California’s three desert regions: the Great Basin, the Mojave, and the Sonoran. Bruce Pavlik examines how these regions gave rise to endemic species and considers the adaptations plant, animal, and human communities have made to these arid lands.


*Everyone Had Cameras: Photography and Farmworkers in California, 1850–2000.* By Richard Steven Street. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2008. xvi + 719 pp. Photographs, notes, and index. $105 cloth, $34.95 paper. Professional photographer Richard Steven Street’s book examines both the historical evolution of photography pertaining to farm workers and how photographers shaped the public’s understanding of agricultural labor and the farm workers’ movement. He considers the work of well-known figures like Ansel Adams and Dorothea Lange as well as the photography of countless amateurs who documented California agriculture.

*Making an American Festival: Chinese New Year in San Francisco’s Chinatown.* By Chiou-Ling Yeh. Berkeley, University of California Press, 2008. xiv + 315 pp. $60 cloth, $24.95 paper. This book uses Chinese New Year celebrations in San Francisco to explore the creation and expression of ethnic identity after the Second World War. Yeh suggests that during the Cold War the local Chinese community used these festivals to declare a patriotic American identity and proclaim opposition to the communist regime in China. By the 1970s and 1980s, though, Chinese New Year celebrations became contested ground, as some groups challenged the control of the Chinatown elite over the content and meaning of these festivals.

*New Deal Art in Arizona.* By Betsy Fahlman. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2009. xvi + 203 pp. $49.95 cloth. Photographs, map, notes, bibliography, and index. Betsy Fahlman examines photographs, paintings, and sculpture produced by various New Deal agencies. She considers both the way the New Deal created new opportunities for artists and how the work they produced helped shape the state’s identity.
Undermining Race: Ethnic Identities in Arizona Copper Camps, 1880-1920. By Phylis Cancilla Martinelli. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2009. xii + 225 pp. Map, table, photographs, notes, bibliography, and index. $50 cloth. This volume focuses on Italian immigrants in three copper camps. Martinelli explores how this group did not fit neatly into either a “white” or “non-white” category and how they thus complicated their employers’ efforts to use racial distinctions to maintain control over the labor force.
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