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alchemical has been widely known, but Warlick’s attempts here both to specify the symbolic content of certain paintings and to broaden our understanding of the intellectual context in which Ernst was working are enormously rewarding. Her excursions into alchemical ideas are particularly helpful in explaining the artist’s experiments in collage and his extremely frequent invocation of androgynous figures and solar imagery. Without delving deeply into subjects such as the nature of the alembic, the meanings of the primary alchemical colors of red, white, and black, and the conventions for depiction of the philosopher’s stone, we would not understand Ernst’s images nearly so well. But perhaps most admirable is Warlick’s interpretive caution; she suggests interpretations but does not push her claims too far. On numerous occasions, she reminds the reader that Ernst’s paintings teem with symbols—some historical, some mystical, some autobiographical, some sexual, some psychological. His fragmented or flayed bodies may be read as comical reactions to the classical tradition, as reflections of Freudian theory, or as alchemical androgynes—but, too, they reflect “the more somber awareness of the fragility of the human body that Ernst gained from his wartime experiences” (p. 47). Alchemy provided a useful metaphor for the creative process and for Ernst’s attempts to overcome the dualities of his personality; but the ectelic “magic” of his paintings was one essentially of his age and of his own devising.

Though this book belongs chiefly on the art historian’s shelf, some aspects of Warlick’s quest will be of interest to intellectual historians and historians of science as well. Her chapter on Paris surrealism, in particular, shows how appealing occultist arts and symbols were precisely to the most modern-minded writers and artists and suggests interesting overlaps between psychological inquiries and séances, artistic experimentation and encounters with hermetic texts. This combination of the modern and the mystical is something we have generally been unable to comprehend and to treat responsibly; that the time for understanding it has come may be signaled by the appearance not only of Warwick’s book but, even more importantly, of Corinna Treitel’s A Science for the Soul: Occultism and the Genesis of the German Modern (Johns Hopkins, forthcoming). It is time we recognized that occultism is not necessarily associated with reactionary politics and an antidemocratic worldview; it was possible for the Paris surrealists to love Hermes Trismegistus as well as Hegel and Communism (Warlick, p. 103). As Treitel argues, the occult arts were often employed to extend the artist’s or the scientist’s vision to realms the nineteenth century did not dare to tread. In the case of Max Ernst, alchemy was the means to pursue what was, in the end, a very modern quest for transcendence.

Suzanne Marchand


Scott Michaelson’s central, radical egalitarian arguments in this tough, very smart series of studies are that the project of anthropology to conceptualize humanity through cultural differences—is a failed project and ought to be terminated; that multiculturalism, in its various guises and forms, essentially reproduces that failure by attempting to build on and project those cultural differences/similarities; and that the only solution is to stop defining humans in such terms altogether and to recognize that the only human commonality on which to build a future world of justice and equality is the distinction between the individual self and the exterior world. Anthropology and its derivative late twentieth-century multiculturalisms are inherently “projects of expulsion and domination” of cultural others; as Michaelson sums up the case, “the production of culture—which is anthropology—must find a stop. ‘Custer’ must die, and so therefore must ‘Indians’” (p. 31).

In advancing the demise of anthropological multiculturalism, Michaelson interrogates American anthropology at its foundations in the middle third of the nineteenth century. In five carefully researched and well-wrought essays he exposes the auto-anthropological, and sometimes anti-anthropological, writings and contributions of Amerindian figures that were part of the production of anthropological “classics.” Jane Johnston’s (and her Ojibwa family’s) erased roles in her husband Henry Schoolcraft’s works, and the revealing contestation over expertise and authority in the writing of Amerindian history between Schoolcraft and his Amerindian bête noire, David Cusick, open the series. The second essay engages “whiteness” studies of recent years (on which Michaelson has previously written) by examining the use of the language of color in the works of James Fenimore Cooper and his Pequot contemporary William Apess. Michaelson concludes that for Cooper the lives of Amerindians, like those of the
American beaver, were fated to disappear from the earth and, thus, that Cooper “‘colonizes’ color in order to secure white identity.” The discussion of the tense, complex relationship between Lewis Henry Morgan and Ely S. Parker, and between their textual productions, is central to Michaelson’s argument, in the third essay, that not only Amerindian auto-anthropology but also subversive anti-anthropology is to be found fragmentally but nonetheless solidly at the foundations of American anthropology’s classics. There are two additional chapters, equally stimulating, on the writings of Christianized Amerindians and on the borders between history and anthropology as seen in a comparison, or dialectic, between the works of William H. Prescott and John Rollin Ridge.

The final chapter, or “Coda,” shifts ground from ethnological literature per se to examine (and undermine) the claims of empirical method in the early Mayan archaeological and epigraphic work of John Lloyd Stephens and his curious, little-known doppelgänger Benjamin Moore Norman. In lucid passages Michaelson focuses on Stephens’s “mechanics of vision”—“the maps, the clearing of the ground, the platforms, the camera that supplies line, perspective, and shade”—as the all-important “strategies for representation and comprehension” (p. 173; emphasis in original) that hold at bay the looming possibility of incomprehensible, radical alterity in the Central American jungles. Archaeology, the author argues, establishes through its mechanisms a “grid of intelligibility” that gives the appearance of creating structure from a “swirling, confusing abyss”—but this “archaeologicality,” as he terms the heart of the project, is all whistling in the dark, building prehistoric castles in the air. In the process, he suggests, Stephens operated to write the current Amerindian population out of the narrative but preserved (thereby) the critical hierarchical distinctions always at the heart of anthropology (p. 180).

Structurally, Michaelson’s often brilliant examinations suffer from a proper conclusion—it is best, I found, to return often to the “Prolegomenon,” which lays out the essential arguments and is enriched with the reading of each additional chapter (and vice versa). The scholarship is impressive, the textual treatments are incisive, and Michaelson’s sensitive humor leavens the serious, sometimes saddening expositions. This volume should be required self-examination for every student of anthropology, ethnic studies, or Native American studies.

CURTIS M. HINSLEY


In *The Works*, Betsy Bradley provides a wide-ranging survey of the factories, foundries, warehouses, and utility buildings erected over three centuries to house America’s steadily intensifying pursuit of large-scale production. With precise descriptions and many illustrations, she suggests the intricate interrelationship of building function and design and the connections of both to evolving ideals of industrial management. A glossary and bibliography of primary sources, many drawn from arcane industry-specific trade journals after what must have been very patient searching, add further value to this profile of a ubiquitous building type.

A number of scholars have recently started to include factories in architectural timelines, granting them a cultural importance akin to that of civic, residential, and other more conventionally celebrated structures. Historians of labor, technology, and industry understand the factory to be an integral part of the production process, helping to direct the flow of human effort, materials, and finished goods. Bradley, focusing primarily on buildings erected between about 1860 and 1930, has an eye for small but suggestive contributions to these inquiries. She inventories the array of chimney shapes available circa 1900 (the octagonal chimney was a compromise between the costly round and the inefficient square models), options for company letterhead imagery (including a few well-dressed visitors in a picture of one’s plant could lend respectability even to a brewery), and choices in rooflines, window shapes, and brick colors (all of which still constitute much of today’s urban landscape). Because she is so intent on laying out alternatives, we become sensitized to the ways in which even such apparently uniform structures represent discretion and subjectivity on the parts of their creators. In the last portion of the book, we sample the huge body of argumentation between architects and engineers about “appropriate” aesthetics for industrial buildings after 1900, a discourse that alerts us to surprising, and perhaps ironic, conceptual ambitions behind outwardly prosaic buildings.

*The Works* may have the most impact on preservationists and other investigators for whom multicausal explanations of architectural change still represent a relatively innovative approach. Those inclined to see design history only as a chain of stylistic influences among builders, and