in his Acknowledgements (xiii). Throughout the 277 pages of opinion and memory two fundamental concepts are echoed by all: the *Arkansas Gazette*’s history was a chronicle, a history of the state itself. It was “Arkansas’s paper, and they were proud of it, even though they didn’t agree with it many times” (18). The second belief by those who were the *Arkansas Gazette* is that the liberal voice of Arkansas is now lost: “[t]he Gazette’s influence on Arkansas was profound, critical . . . I was talking to Dale Bumpers (Democratic Senator from AR) and he said that if the *Gazette* fell, Arkansas would get like Mississippi and Alabama. It’s already happened, a decade later,” suggests one narrator (273). Unlike other Southern states who had joined the ranks of conservative Republicans decades before, the death of the *Arkansas Gazette*, which had favored Democrats editorially, meant that the winners of the newspaper war were not only the *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, but also the growing Republican party in Arkansas.

This book is significant in documenting the history of an American newspaper and in chronicling the political direction of one upper South state.  

**SONDRA GORDY**

University of Central Arkansas


In *Contested Histories in Public Space*, editors Daniel J. Walkowitz and Lisa Maya Knauer have assembled a collection of thirteen essays that examine museums, monuments, and other public spaces across six continents to understand how postcolonial theory has shaped the representation and construction of national narratives. Multiculturalism and identity politics in an era of decolonization, the editors argue, has irrevocably challenged such narratives by illuminating “the history of race and empire in public spaces” (viii). *Contested Histories* is the second volume in a two-part *Radical History Review* series, “Radical Perspectives.” Volume 1, *Memory and the Impact of Political Transformations in Public Space* (2004) also edited by Walkowitz and Knauer, explores how memory and interpretations of the past in public spaces belong not just to academics and public history professionals, but have become locations for broader political and social debates. The volume’s contributors show how contests over public representations of a nation’s historical narratives go beyond the scope of current political regimes, and often reveal longer-standing struggles that resurface in the wake of political upheaval—the fall of the Soviet Union, for example. *Contested Histories* builds on *Memory*, dealing with many of the same themes, but focuses specifically on the role of postcolonial theory in shaping the “interrogations of how race and empire are implicated, referenced, or obscured in the construction of national narratives”
In this sense, volume 2 expands on and engages more fully with the issues of race and reconciliation introduced in volume 1, while wrestling with the legacy of colonial oppression in shaping the figurative and literal display of national memory. Despite ongoing conflicts between Aboriginal peoples and white Australians, for example, the significance of many cultural heritage sites lies in the creation of space, which can both inform and create “a platform for debate” (87). In fact, all the essays engage with the struggle between the twentieth-century modernist paradigm and the more recent postmodern, postcolonial interpretations.

*Contested Histories* is divided into four thematic sections. Section 1, “First Things First,” considers the relationship between “national” institutions and indigenous groups or “first” people in Australia, Canada, and New Zealand, all former British colonies that are still part of the British Commonwealth. Ruth B. Phillips and Mark Salber Phillips’ essay, “Contesting Time, Place, and Nation in the First Peoples’ Hall of the Canadian Museum of Civilization,” beautifully exemplifies the impact of postcolonial theory and late twentieth-century multiculturalism in altering the public display of Canada’s national narrative. In the Canadian Museum of Civilization (CMC), visitors entering the First Peoples’ Hall are confronted immediately with the country’s complex history, where they encounter an Algonquin greeting accompanied by a computer-generated image of Natives in a nineteenth-century encampment on the bank of the Ottawa River gazing upon a twentieth-century Parliament building across the opposite shore. Opening in 2003, the First Peoples’ Hall reflects a “rupture with the modernist traditions of museological representation” by offering an unprecedented interpretation of Canadian history through Native perspectives (50). Whereas older sections of the CMC are organized as a celebration of nation-building and the path to “progress,” the development of First Peoples’ Hall—created amidst ongoing political negotiations, legal action, and reconciliation measures between Native and non-Native Canadians—sought to “inform and . . . disrupt tired stereotypes and ways of thinking” (67). The resulting exhibition allows the CMC to act as “an honest broker for the nation of nations it purports to represent” by refraining from offering a “resolution” between Natives and non-Natives when such accord does not fully exist outside museum walls (67). Section 2, “Colonial Legacies and Winners’ Tales,” investigates how postcolonial nation-states continue to “grapple with the colonial legacies that frame their internal cultural politics” (14). The standout essay here by Durba Ghosh looks at how a British Library exhibit on the exchange of commodities between Asia and Britain was made more palatable for public consumption by whitewashing an untidy imperial past as an attempt to articulate “Britishness in multicultural terms” (106).

The remaining two sections deal with the role of the state—broadly defined. “State Stories” explores how the state mediates racialized histories for both local and international consumption in a South African cultural monument, in historical textbooks in Ecuador, and in a political tug of war over the reconfiguration of an Oaxacan public square. “Under-Stated Stories,” the
book’s fourth and final section, focuses on external challenges to and “internal fissures” in the state’s supposed “monopoly over collective memory and history making” (18). Of particular interest are Laurent Dubois’ essay on the display of Caribbean heroes of African descent in Paris’s Pantheon museum and Knauer’s essay on heritage tourism in Cuba, which offer non-U.S. perspectives on how the decision to celebrate formerly ignored legacies of slavery disrupted national narratives and created uncomfortable discourses.

Walkowitz and Knauer argue that we are witnessing a “significant moment in the history of public history” (5) for two reasons. First, because history has been recast as heritage in the wake of deindustrialization and economic restructuring, public spaces have become cultural capital for everyone from politicians and developers to grass-roots organizers who hope to revive sagging local economies. Moreover, unequal access to shrinking public and private funding has shifted the balance of power to those who can secure financial and political support. Second, the editors argue that at a time of struggle between adherents of modernism and postcolonialism, the continual threat of war—whether wars of independence or “contemporary imperial ventures”—has led to state policy which “unjustifiably” simplifies complex and “untidy” pasts, and casts critical examinations of such as a “lack of patriotism” (6). Walkowitz’s essay on how Ellis Island, long a “site of national citizenship,” became a reinvigorated national symbol in the post-9/11 era is one example (139). Efforts to forge a more cohesive national narrative in order to “mobilize” the support of uneasy publics for such ventures have, the editors conclude, taken on a “new political valence” (7).

While the latter argument certainly has merit, it is a stretch to call attention to such policy as something new or different in the postcolonial and postmodern eras. During the Cold War, global anticomunist policymakers used similar national symbols to galvanize the public against communist enemies, just as communist agents sought to rally their publics against imperialists. Moreover, purveyors of cultural tourism and history as “heritage” worldwide have long justified downplaying or ignoring racial and social conflicts in an effort to attract tourists. This, however, is a minor quibble. This volume is an important contribution to the literature, particularly as it places the complexities of confronting race, reconciliation, identity, and citizenship in public representations of the past in a global perspective. Further, the editors expeditiously caution readers that “the public” is an imprecise term that may be better framed as “multiple publics,” paying heed to the reality of multicultural or multiethnic societies and incorporating the “divergent and often competing interests and different stakes in how histories are represented” (3).

Public historians—whether academics or practitioners—will find much of value within the pages of Contested Histories. At the core of these essays is the persistent and vital question of interpretive authority. Curators, historians, “heritage professionals,” and other interested parties bring varied amounts of formal and informal training to the table, and often share their power and responsibilities not only with community members, but with financial stake-
holders as well. Students and scholars will benefit from the broad perspectives on questions of nationhood, citizenship, representation, and authenticity presented here. Understanding the issues at stake on both the local and global levels provides powerful jumping-off points for deeper discussions. This volume may enrich urban histories as well, particularly as it relates to the use of cultural capital for economic gain, the delicate negotiations that can occur in the construction of heritage tourism sites, and the political and economic costs of ignoring a contested past. Walkowitz and Knauer have compiled a rich and instructive collection of essays that, together, demonstrate the "international and spatial reach" of complex historical debates as they played out in a diverse array of public spaces (2). Finally, the authors remind readers how the construction of memory in public space can have powerful reverberations in the everyday lives of ordinary people. Public historians will continue to confront these themes over and over—as practitioners, as teachers, as citizens, and as participants.

ANDREA THABET

University of California, Santa Barbara


In an attempt to escape the limiting features of a linear monologue, Tim Ingold suggests the reframing of our perspective on the model of the rhizome, “a dense and tangled cluster of interlaced threads or filaments, any point in which can be connected to any other.” 1 This abandonment of a genealogical perspective supports a more nuanced investigation of the dynamic relationships of a world in motion. Ronald Rudin, in his Remembering and Forgetting in Acadie, surveys the remembered and commemorated histories of the Acadians, the Francophones tracing their origins to the early seventeenth-century settlement of today’s Canadian Maritime provinces.

The settlers deposited by the French Crown founded a collection of modest agricultural settlements, assisted by local Indigenous people. In the wars between the English and French the Acadians attempted to maintain a strict neutrality. After the collapse of New France in the mid-eighteenth century, the British deported a large part of the population, an ethnic cleansing, to other parts of their North American empire or back to France. The revival of Acadie, perhaps best understood as the idea of a distinct people incorporating both regional survivors and ethnic diaspora, began in the mid-nineteenth century. Rudin’s history begins with the commemorations and memorializations that followed.

Rudin divides his book into two parts, each identifying a primary, and some-