

expanded globally via affiliate clubs. A handful of leaders are featured as ushers of 4-H policy and reform advocates, but none drive the narrative like the *life* of the organization itself. Similarly, 4-H'ers are used as examples, rather than deeply examined characters. In this way, Rosenberg has accomplished his outlined task of an institutional history of 4-H. However, it is worth considering what, or in this case who, might be lost through this choice to foreground 4-H as a whole and not as a collection of individuals. Does he access farm life and the farm home or merely write *about* these experiences? Ultimately, Rosenberg's personal reflections offer bookends of positionality through which readers can create a frame for understanding the text, as he shares memories of driving on rural roads through Indiana farmland as a child and as an adult. Again, one is left with a sense that this text may leave you close to rural life and youth 4-H'ers but not within rural experience.

Despite these limited critiques, *The 4-H Harvest* promises to be fruitfully placed in classroom conversations and should be referenced by historians of education, particularly those developing research on vocationalism, noninstitutional education, extracurricular education, rural education, and common schools. For example, this text will work well in connection with Glenn Lauzon's forthcoming edited volume *Educating a Working Society*. Introductory social foundations classes would benefit from close readings of excerpted chapters, including chapter 1, "Agrarian Futurism, Rural Degeneracy, and the Origins of 4-H" for an alternative reading of the rural life movement. Similarly, queer political history could be engaged by selecting chapters 2–4 on rural manhood, 4-H body politics, and farm families. Important conversations can begin from this text. Rosenberg repeatedly probes what role institutions—like 4-H and various levels of governance—should play in private lives. Through examination of farm boys, farm girls, and farm families, he asks when is the body a public good to be shaped by the state? Further, conversations on gender and sexuality more often excluded from the history of common schools and rural consolidation can begin here.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

SARA CLARK

Jennifer Guiliano. *Indian Spectacle: College Mascots and the Anxiety of Modern America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2015. 194 pp. Hardcover \$80.00. Paper \$27.95.

Broad societal attention to Native American mascots has resurged recently with the prominent controversy over the Washington, DC, professional football team called the "R—skins"—a racial epithet for Native

Americans. This controversy is but one moment in a broader history of the use of Native American nicknames, mascots, and other symbols by professional, collegiate, and P through 12 sports teams. Controversies over these symbols are complicated for a number of reasons: the range of support and resistance among both Native Americans and non-Native Americans; the symbols that range from general monikers (R—skins and Indians) to Native American nations (Seminoles, Utes, etc.), some of which are permitted by the eponymous Native nation; the variety of sanctioned and unsanctioned fan practices that accompany Native American mascots; and some important differences between the goals of professional sports organizations, colleges, and P through 12 institutions.

These complexities can make it difficult to support sweeping judgments about the use of Native American symbols by sports teams, and thus require a close analysis of the particular historical contexts and networks that contributed to the use of Native American mascots. This is the primary strength of Jennifer Guiliano's book, *Indian Spectacle: College Mascots and the Anxiety of Modern America*, which offers a historical account of the complex relationship between the development of collegiate football, Native American mascots, and American masculinity in the first half of the twentieth century, with a particular focus on weaving together the stories of five universities: University of Illinois, Stanford University, Miami University, University of North Dakota, and Florida State University.

Guiliano opens her book with a description of the spectacle that accompanied the 1952 Rose Bowl match between the Stanford University Indians and the University of Illinois Fighting Illini. She highlights the performances of Chief Illiniwek—a white man dressed in Indian garb and trained in “Indian dance” through the Boy Scouts of America—and Prince Lightfoot—an enrolled member of the Yurok nation—as “the apex of what college football had been trying to accomplish for more than a century: a commercial spectacle that blended athletics, fan participation, and national audiences” (p. 1). This opening story serves as a synecdoche for her broader analysis of the construction of what she terms the “Indian spectacle.” Through the framework of American masculinity, her central argument is that the project of higher education after the Great War was enmeshed in masculine, racialized, classed, and nationalistic university identities that were expressed through football and the spectacle of faux Indian half-time shows. She tells a story not of Native American performances of identity, but of “how faux Indians performed a set of behaviors that white audiences perceived as representations of Indian culture and race” that highlight “how white middle-class men imagined themselves and constructed their own form of Indian identity by sampling from historical tropes, perceptions, and

misconceptions” (p. 9). This focus, while reminiscent of Philip J. Deloria’s *Playing Indian* (1998), provides a unique historical argument about the ways in which the faux Indian half-time performances in college football reveal wider cultural anxieties about masculinity, race, class, and education.

The book presents a chronological history that begins by sketching out the rise of college football in the early twentieth century, arguing that college football was a central vehicle through which white male middle-class identity was expressed and with which concomitant anxieties were grappled. Guiliano then turns to a fascinating examination of the origin of the University of Illinois’ Chief Illiniwek mascot tradition. She reveals how Chief Illiniwek’s performance, as well as other Native mascot performances, were tied to the activities of the Boy Scouts of America, particularly through a national network of jamborees at which white boys were taught supposedly authentic portrayals of Indian dancing. This chapter, and the remainder of the book, privileges the University of Illinois as a central player in the development of faux Indian performances in collegiate athletics.

The book’s narrative continues with an examination of the role of marching bands in college half-time shows. While the link between marching bands and faux Native half-time shows may not be immediately obvious, Guiliano articulates how the particular songs marching bands played contributed to the story being told in Native mascot performances. Guiliano then turns to a slightly muddled discussion of the limitations of the half-time spectacle, situating it as a phenomenon that was more common among large midwestern schools that had prominent football teams such as the University of Illinois. Yet smaller schools—in this case, the University of North Dakota and Miami University—also attempted to articulate athletic identity and broader college identity with Native Americans, even without the superior financial resources and audience base of larger universities.

Likewise expanding her gaze beyond the University of Illinois, the next chapter turns to the histories of Stanford University and Florida State University to reveal the important role of students in forming a university identity in an effort to grapple with their anxieties and “sense of who they were in the modern world” (p. 70). The case of Stanford reveals how students resisted university attempts to define student identity through an Indian mascot, whereas the case of Florida State demonstrates how athletes actively sought to create a university identity.

The final chapter focuses on the ways in which females and Native performers troubled the half-time spectacle in the 1940s and 1950s. By examining the performances of University of Illinois’s Princess Illiniwek and Stanford’s Prince Lightfoot (performed by a Yurok tribal

member) in relation to cartooned caricatures of Indians (Miami University), Guiliano argues that while they did allow for counternarratives, these performances ultimately “reaffirmed its [the collegiate community’s] desire for white male athletic bodies in service to the nation” (p. 105). Guiliano concludes the book with an argument for the importance of a rich historical account of the development of Native American collegiate mascots toward our collective understanding of contemporary struggles over representation and Native mascots.

The overall narrative of the book offers a sound and insightful analysis of the historical development of Native American mascots vis-à-vis cultural anxieties over race, class, and gender in the first half of the twentieth century. Yet despite the persuasiveness of this macronarrative, the micro level of historical detail in the arguments of individual chapters is at times somewhat wanting. While Guiliano relies on an impressive historical archive, at times her claims lack the development and strong evidence they deserve. For instance, at several points in the book, she makes claims about heteronormativity and the policing of homosexuality through the half-time spectacle performances. Yet these claims, while they support her larger interpretation, lack strong archival support. Likewise, while the overall argument of the book is clear, the arguments and narratives of individual chapters could have been clearer. Nonetheless, this book offers a valuable starting point for a better understanding of the historical development of collegiate mascots, faux Indian half-time shows, and their linkage to broader societal anxieties over higher education, race, class, and gender.

As a scholar writing from a university that uses Native American symbols for its sports teams—the “Utes” nickname and a drum and feather logo—I found that this book offered new insight and historical topoi that help me make sense of the historical and contemporary use of Native symbols at my university. I, therefore, recommend that scholars at universities that use Native symbols read this book. A notable absence in the book, however, is attention to the universities that have gained permission from eponymous Native American nations to use mascots and other symbols. While this falls outside the scope of her chosen historical time period of the 1920s–1950s, it represents a fascinating continuation of this historical relationship. How does permission by eponymous Native American nations, as is the case for Florida State and University of Utah, either trouble or reinforce this narrative of the role of the faux Indian half-time spectacle in managing white male middle-class identity? How does permission interact with the Native American mascot performers she discusses in the book?

Guiliano argues that her book is a “purely historical analysis. It makes no attempt to grapple with contemporary debates, ethics, or

voices” (p. 13). While this statement is understandable, I would argue that the book does move beyond a pure historical account in important ways. Indeed, the hallmark of this book is in bringing history to light in the contemporary conversation about Native American mascots. As Guiliano writes, “It is vital that we return to the historical roots of mascotry to understand its colonial contexts” (p. 110).

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

DANIELLE ENDRES

Andrew Woolford. *This Benevolent Experiment: Indigenous Boarding Schools, Genocide, and Redress in Canada and the United States*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2015. 431 pp. Hardcover \$90.00.

In this comparison of the settler colonial projects of residential/boarding school education in Canada and the United States, Andrew Woolford uses the term *genocide* for tactical reasons. Acknowledging that the term itself is not enough to prompt action, he argues that it can set the stage for a *decolonizing* redress (not a redress that maintains the status quo). In his conclusion, Woolford argues for a collective accountability for policies and practices that aimed to solve the “Indian Problem” by eliminating Indigenous groups. He highlights the alleged benevolence of said policies and practices in his title to make the point that benevolence itself can operate as a destructive force. Woolford frames his contribution to the scholarship on residential/boarding schools as the understanding that genocide is a complex process unfolding in an uneven manner. As accurate as that assessment may be, it is an unsatisfying answer to the two bold questions posed in the conclusion. In affluent settler colonial societies such as the United States and Canada, how do we radically alter a way of life? How do settlers come to grips with the fact that they live on and benefit from Indigenous lands? The eight chapters that precede the conclusion are full of details culled from archived interviews with boarding school survivors (such as the Doris Duke oral history interviews of the 1960s and 1970s and Sally Hyer’s transcripts of interviews from the Santa Fe Indian School), secondary literature from both countries, and testimonies presented to Canada’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The details and Woolford’s analyses of them cannot quite bear the weight of the two big questions that conclude the book, but the scale of his comparison, several interpretive insights, and the framing within genocide studies constitute significant contributions to residential/boarding school scholarship.