

and to establish African Americans as professional social workers. Furthermore, this “soft-spoken and non-confrontational” (p. 37) leader sponsored fellowships funded by philanthropists to train black men and women to become social workers. Meanwhile, he rose through the ranks of the profession’s hierarchy, serving as treasurer of the National Conference of Social Work (NCSW) in 1925 and as its vice president in 1933.

Of particular significance to persons interested in Indiana history is Armfield’s interpretation of an incident in Indianapolis that resulted in a feud within the NCSW in 1936. An Indianapolis hotel had established a code that prevented blacks and whites from socializing in its bar. The rank-and-file social workers wrote into their bylaws that the conference could not be held in a place that “did not accommodate black and white

social workers equally” (p. 66). Edith Abbott of the University of Chicago, who took a position that evokes present-day controversial issues of race, believed that the matter was not one with which the conference should concern itself. For Armfield, “Abbott’s indifference reveals a major lack of sensitivity about race relations within the social work profession” (p. 67).

Armfield succeeds in depicting what life was like for intelligent African American reformers in one of the most inclusive professions during the age of de jure segregation. One wonders what life was like in more exclusive professions.

VERNON J. WILLIAMS is Professor of African American and African Diaspora Studies at Indiana University, Bloomington. His books include *The Social Sciences and Theories of Race* (2006).



### *For Home and Country* *World War I Propaganda and the Home Front*

By Celia Malone Kingsbury

(Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010. Pp. xiv, 309. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$45.00.)

In *For Home and Country*, Celia Malone Kingsbury assembles an eclectic archive—ranging from memoirs and magazine fiction to children’s books, posters, sheet music, and even paper dolls—to shed new light on the power of words and images to mobilize a nation for war. Drawing mostly on U.S. sources but including material

from several other nations as well, Kingsbury investigates the rhetorical relationship between the home and the state: by representing women, children, and families as proper subjects for war mobilization, creators of propaganda tapped into existing social networks of affect and care and used them to advance war aims.

*For Home and Country* thus offers not only a history of the home front, but an analysis of the literary and political uses of the idea of home itself.

Novels, magazines, and visual images conveyed multiple messages, each crafted for different audiences. The centrality of “home” to World War I propaganda meant that more than anything, those messages presented models of patriotic womanhood. They depicted women as toiling homemakers and sacrificing consumers, or as nurses and volunteers, but rarely in ways that challenged existing gender norms. In magazine fiction, Kingsbury uncovers stories that demonized the “selfish and unethical woman of wealth” (p. 71) and cast aspersions on early twentieth-century consumer culture. Elsewhere, government and press initiatives around food conservation amplified publicity supporting the emerging domestic science movement.

Kingsbury then turns to wartime serial fiction written for girls—a source almost completely untouched by earlier scholars. She subtly concludes that such books were unconventional—but that they were also unthreatening. “While each girl may exceed the cultural expectations of girlhood, may in fact ignore the gender boundaries that would apply under peaceful circumstances, none presumes male liberties” (p. 151). A further chapter links children’s literature with images of children deployed in wartime propaganda; the “tragedy,” she writes, “is that children become

pawns in the struggle” (p. 217) for war mobilization. They were not the only ones: Kingsbury also shows that images could motivate men and shore up traditional notions of masculinity.

Kingsbury is at her best as she surveys the landscape of U.S. popular literature produced in the heat of the Great War itself. Such noncanonical material has received far too little attention from literary scholars, who have focused on the modernism of the postwar Lost Generation. But “much literature was written during the war,” she explains, “and this writing tells us in patriotic language what was happening or what was expected to happen on the home front” (p. 6). *For Home and Country* depicts a nation awash in hastily written prose, full-throated in its enthusiasm for war. A wartime poster depicting Uncle Sam as the Pied Piper (p. 170) seems festive at first glance, but Kingsbury emphasizes the tale’s disturbing undertones of brainwashing and seduction: “In teaching children to hate and defile those of a different nationality, in teaching them to follow the Pied Piper, propaganda creates potential killers” (p. 215). Scholars would do well to follow her advice that we must scrutinize more carefully what American children read during wartime.

A dogged researcher of forgotten popular novels and children’s books, Kingsbury is less deft at painting the big picture. *For Home and Country* devotes little attention to the institutional structures of cultural production and circulation, or even to the re-

lationship between the wartime state and the publishing industry. Deeper research into government sources could complement Kingsbury's close textual analysis. Likewise, the author's framing device of propaganda can obscure as much as it reveals: *For Home and Country* relies on an older social science literature that makes it difficult to find the resistant readers who surely pushed back at much of the popular culture Kingsbury grapples with here.

Scholars owe Celia Malone Kingsbury a debt for the research that went

into *For Home and Country*, and further studies will surely emerge from the riches in its bibliography. We very much need a history of popular literature during World War I, and to understand propaganda in its multiple forms, public and private. *For Home and Country* begins to show us the way.

CHRISTOPHER CAPOZZOLA is Associate Professor of History at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is the author of *Uncle Sam Wants You: World War I and the Making of the Modern American Citizen* (2008).



### *The Rise of Chicago's Black Metropolis, 1920-1929*

By Christopher Robert Reed

(Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2011. Pp. viii, 274. Notes, bibliography, index. \$55.00.)

Christopher Reed examines the growth and maturation of Chicago's African American community between the end of World War I and the onset of the Great Depression. In their classic 1945 study, sociologists St. Clair Drake and Horace Cayton dubbed the racially segregated neighborhood on Chicago's South Side "Black Metropolis"—a culturally and economically dynamic "city within a city." Building on the optimistic tone of Drake and Cayton's study, Reed's account acknowledges the personal and collective agency of residents who built this community in the midst of difficult circumstances, describing the book as "a personal salute to courageous and productive Chicagoans of the 1920s" (p. xiii). He argues that

the term "ghetto," which historians began to use in the 1960s to connote dysfunction, does not accurately describe this all-black district in the first half of the twentieth century.

Reed opens with a discussion of the quantitative and qualitative changes to Chicago's African American community during World War I and the immediate postwar years. The mass influx of southern migrants—responding to an acute labor demand in wartime industries—resulted in an immense expansion of the city's black population. A sense of confidence characterized this recently urbanized, industrialized, and modernized African American—the so-called "New Negro" of the 1920s. Reed pays particular attention to the community's elite