cess. She departs from the typical practice in the study of world’s fairs that separates and often subordinates discussions of midway attractions or the “entertainment” zone from the central story of the planning and design of “official” fair exhibits. In so doing, Ganz complicates the division of these categories and demonstrates how fair participants and spectators can sidestep the intentions of organizers and create their own meanings out of the fair experience.

Ganz successfully establishes what set the Century of Progress Exposition apart from previous fairs in its planning, financing, architecture, and vision. Amidst the strained economic times of the Great Depression, the Chicago fair gave corporate America a special opportunity to revitalize cultural perceptions of industry, replacing images of corrupt businesses and rebuilding hope in the future. At the same time, Ganz emphasizes the importance of the fair’s urban location in determining its mission and success.

The book makes two important contributions to the scholarship of the Chicago fair. First, Ganz traces the politics of gender, race, class, and ethnicity in fair organization and participation. She tells counterstories of fair planning that capture the tensions of the cultural moment which includes examining the divisive class battles between society women and “women outsiders” over how to depict woman’s advancement at the fair and the racial inequities in Chicago that complicated participation by the African American community (p. 96). Second, whereas other fair historians have noted the organizational vision of corporate collaboration in designing industry-wide fair exhibits, Ganz deepens our understanding of the difficulties of this model in practice. Collaboration was sometimes successful (as in the dairy industry), but the desire to promote individual corporate brands sometimes inhibited industrial partnering (as in the automotive industry).

With graceful prose and beautiful illustrations, Ganz demonstrates the fair’s central themes of modernist architectural design, financial economy, and material progress. Detailing a rich social history behind the scenes, she also unmask the struggles among the women, African Americans, and organizers from various ethnic groups who tried to set alternative agendas for fair representations. What gave me pause was the contrast between those narratives of conflict, compromise, and defeat and Ganz’s glowing approbation for the ingenuity and cohesion of the central white male planners, Rufus and Charles Dawes and Lenox Lohr. It left this reader wondering if and where the lines of contention were drawn in determining the fair’s financial and conceptual plans. A deeper look into this question might reveal multiple strategies for Chicago’s packaging of American progress at a particularly apprehensive moment of U.S. history.

Bonnie M. Miller
University of Massachusetts at Boston
Boston, Massachusetts


Susan K. Freeman’s *Sex Goes to School* joins an emerging literature on the history of sexuality that examines the rise of sex education in the United States. Until now, the history of sex education has been offered as a history of ideas, and in Freeman’s surmise, historians have done well in examining “the moralizing aspect of sex education, trends in method and epistemology, and critiques of educators’ agendas” (p. xiii). But Freeman moves beyond that initial work to explore the gendered dimensions of sex education as it was introduced into secondary education during the 1940s and 1950s across the United States.

Sex education had its roots in the social hygiene movement of the early twentieth century, which was preoccupied with the dangers of sexual promiscuity. During the 1930s, however, the earlier emphasis on immorality and disease yielded to psychological and social approaches, preparing the way for the middle decades of the twentieth century, which witnessed the normalization of discussions about sexuality with adolescents. As Freeman and others point out, in contrast to collective memory of the era, the 1940s and 1950s were more pro-
gressive than we might assume and also more forward-looking than the decade that followed, which saw a reaction against popular sex education even in the midst of greater toleration for sexual expression in mass culture.

Freeman skillfully navigates the ways that public high school students learned about sexuality and its role in society, examining a wide range of sources, from instructional films, teaching kits, and professional journals to newspapers, magazines, novels, pop psychology, and interviews with women and men who attended high school during the 1940s and 1950s. Two major themes appear in her account: the creation of a “safe space” in the public schools for young people (and particularly girls) to talk about sexuality and its importance in choosing a mate (p. 143); and an insistent emphasis on human reproduction as the purpose of sexual relations, with its unwitting, unselfconscious, and ongoing construction of heterosexuality.

A discussion-oriented approach to sex education was used during the 1940s, an innovation of human relations professionals. The frank, “refreshing” conversations these discussions fostered in high school classrooms placed sexual discourse in the broader context of social relations and gently urged more egalitarian relations between men and women in family life, as well as more openness about sexuality and women’s sexual needs. This set the stage, Freeman intimates, for the women’s movement of the 1960s by quietly advocating for a physical and emotional partnership between women and men in marriage.

Freeman takes every opportunity to remind us that gender roles are seamlessly re-created over time and that heterosexuality is no less a contrivance than clothing styles or table manners. Thus, Sex Goes to School brings an important perspective to our understanding of how and what young people learned about sexuality at a time when high school was becoming a mass institution. Still, many readers will feel that she dwells too often on the “work” of constructing heterosexuality in ways that are, if not ahistorical, at least lacking sympathy for the historical consciousness of its actors, and that strategy at times distracts from the more remarkable aspects of a relatively enlightened moment in the history of sexuality in the United States.

Stephen Lassonde
Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island

The Columbia History of American Television.

Television is a sprawling medium, difficult to characterize historically in a single volume. As an object of study, it is endlessly promiscuous; its complicated modes of production, webs of ownership, regulatory frameworks, and diverse textual forms are matched only by the range of cultural practices that surround its reception. Humanities-based television scholarship trying to make sense of that complexity over the past two decades has been powerfully influenced by cultural studies approaches to history that privilege contextual specificity over broad narrative accounts of the development of national television institutions. While the history of U.S. television is partly the story of the role of an oligopolistic industry in the formation of a collective national community, a closer look reveals cultures of reception and production whose relationship to the larger whole is idiosyncratic or contradictory. The more time we spend in the archive, the more our generalizations fail; television defies easy narrativization.

Gary R. Edgerton’s The Columbia History of American Television approaches this challenge head-on. Part of a Columbia University Press series of American cultural histories intended for the generalist and student reader, the volume seeks to provide a comprehensive account of how “tv ultimately evolves into a convergent technology, a global industry, a viable art form, a social catalyst, and a complex and dynamic reflection of the American mind and character” (p. xvii). This book is best seen as an update of Erik Barnouw’s widely read concise history, Tube of Plenty: The Evolution of American Television (1990). Moving beyond Barnouw, Edgerton has attempted to craft a unified narrative that simultaneously engages