Book Reviews

In the preface to his new book, *Grounded Globalism*, anthropologist James Peacock writes that the old question for southerners was, “How do I relate to the nation?” The new question is “How do I relate to the world?” He enlarges on this to ask, “How do I respond to immigrants, the loss of jobs to foreign countries, to international terrorism? What shall I do about other cultures, new foods, new cars, new religions, new markets, new business opportunities or threats, new travel opportunities or dangers?” (x).

He uses the term “grounded globalism” to mean a global awareness co-existing with an emotional relationship to a locale and a specific culture. The special qualities of life in the South may be altered, but they have not vanished, Peacock argues. The “sufficient core of identity and community” remains and co-exists with global identities (131). He proceeds to give numerous examples, many familiar to anyone living in the South. In one, a woman who grew up in Florida in a multicultural setting accepts a job in Nebraska but comes back to live in Florida because she feels at home there. An anchorwoman on television, she lives in an electronic world at the same time that she is “spatially grounded” in her home. In other words, a sense of place and globalization are not mutually exclusive: both depend on the meanings we attribute to them. The act of creating meaning is metaphysical rather than physical, Peacock asserts, and transcends both local space and global space.

Examining various aspects of southern culture, he discusses first the wide varieties of religious reactions to globalization, showing that the Bible Belt
caricature is misleading. Increasing diversity is a more accurate description, as evidenced in the physical presence of mosques, Hindu temples, and Buddhist retreat centers. He interprets the impact of Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, and other Asian or Middle Eastern religions as inner-oriented, that is, they emphasize inner improvement rather than social improvement. Yet, their presence reinforces global connections. Christian religions have continuously sent missionaries to far lands, and their members have given money to support education and medical care among peoples on the other side of the earth.

Turning to political ideas and actions, he considers the ways that global identity has affected both liberalism and conservatism, noting that “‘liberal’ and ‘conservative’ are points along an ideological spectrum, ‘global’ and ‘local’ along a spatial one” (7). But both kinds of ideology apply in both kinds of domains, global and local. The assumption that conservative is localized and provincial, while liberal is global and cosmopolitan, is too easy (191). Both ideologies have a global outlook. For example, liberals’ defense of civil rights on the local level is analogous to advocacy of human rights on the global level, and significant leaders such as Jimmy Carter have championed both. Conservative values on the local level include preservation of local order, custom, and traditional way of life. Conserving order can also become a global project which necessitates a global strategy to protect the capitalist system and a strong military presence. Creative combinations of these stances also occur.

In the cultural realm, Peacock dares to take up a subject most social scientists avoid: dreams as a way of probing subjective experience. He asks how dreams reflect global influences. Does the “far away” penetrate the “deep within”? Even more unusual in a social science text, he describes his own dreams, a sequence of four, and ventures an interpretation. The sequence presents a combination of stereotypes from his southern childhood and those of immigrants newly arrived. His identity shifts from the first dream to the last in which he becomes the “other,” the immigrant. He goes on to present his informants’ dreams and to comment on Freud’s and then Jung’s interpretation of dreams. Still searching for evidence of globalism’s influence on southern culture, he examines art, architecture, literature, dance, and music. He points out in specific occurrences that the arts are changing, “that ‘far-away’ does influence the deep within” (177).

Peacock sees the identification with the world emerging in the South as a positive development. Globalism liberates, he argues, because this framework draws the attention of southerners from nation to world. When the nation is no longer the major frame in which to define identity, whatever is left over from historical opposition to the northern states becomes obsolete and differences inside the South dissolve, such as between blacks and whites. His argument is that a global framework has a profound influence for change both in a “psychological sense (evidenced in subjectivities) and in a cultural sense (evidenced in values)” (223).

In short, the South is no longer agrarian, nor frontier; it is something new. And yet attachment to place, history, and culture remain. In *Grounded Glob-
James Peacock offers a model for interpreting the changes observable in the South already and changes which are expected to continue in the future. His term “grounded globalism” presents both for public historians and other scholars, as well as general adult readers, a concept that is useful in viewing these changes. It’s an enlightening concept that makes sense of new experiences as they interact with the desire and need to hang on to identity and to the best of what we have in the American South. This is original, striking work.
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In this brief volume, Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh takes a new look at the Camp Grant Massacre, the killing of some 100 Western Apache people by a force of Anglo, Hispanic, and Tohono O’Odham civilians in central Arizona in 1871. The Apache victims, who were under the protection of the U.S. Army at Camp Grant as part of a peace agreement, were living on their aboriginal lands along Aravaipa Creek, a tributary of the San Pedro River about forty miles northeast of Tucson. The perpetrators were from Tucson and nearby O’Odham villages. With participation and support from some of Tucson’s business and political leaders, the group managed to evade military intervention as they carried out their carefully planned attack. Striking at dawn, they bludgeoned, stabbed, shot, raped, and mutilated their victims. They took some thirty children captive, most of whom were enslaved in Tucson or sold into Mexico. Under pressure from the federal government, the First District Court for the Territory of Arizona indicted one hundred men for 108 counts of murder. The jury deliberated for nineteen minutes before finding the entire group not guilty.

The massacre is an example of what Colwell-Chanthaphonh calls “phantom history.” The story is not unknown—the author identifies sixty-five publications ranging from newspaper articles to books that address the massacre—but is largely ignored by the non-Apache people of Southern Arizona today. Writing of the attack a few years later, organizer and participant William S. Oury recalled the party enjoying “full satisfaction of a job well done” (quoted at p. 65). Tucson’s citizens for the most part shared that opinion. The year after the attack they elected one of the participants, Sidney Delong, mayor of the city. Over time, the massacre faded from public history. Today, streets, schools, neighborhoods, and mountaintops around Tucson are named after some of the atrocity’s planners and collaborators. Yet the majority of Tucson residents, even those who like the author are interested in the region’s cultural history and who have spent most of their lives in the region, know little or nothing of it.