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The only case where I was left wanting more was in the various authors' reactions to the Korean War. Admittedly biased, for I believe that the Korean War had a great but unrecognized influence on the American people, I looked in vain for more than film references (201–2) to this heating up of the Cold War.

This book concentrates on the West, as westerners like to identify it, and does not directly include Iowa. But for Iowans who identify themselves as either westerners or midwesterners depending on the issue, this book can be very informative, for it helps explain the state's relationship to the more western states, and illustrates the degree to which Iowa was affected differently by the Cold War. That story remains to be written, but perhaps this study will move that along. I highly recommend *The Cold War American West, 1945–1989* to anyone interested in understanding America in the last half of the century.

---


**REVIEWED BY MICHAEL J. ANDERSON, CLARKE COLLEGE**

Richard M. Fried traces the rise and decline of patriotic pageantry during the Cold War. He argues that his subject offers a chance to uncover the "soft" side of Cold War anticommunism (ix). The study of patriotic pageantry, according to Fried, can help answer the question, "How did Americans when not consumed by Alger Hiss or Stalin or Korea, articulate their concern about communism and translate it into patriotism?" (ix). While admitting that this is not a work of "bottom up" social history, since many of those involved were elites, Fried argues that the study of these pageants offers a "whiff of the grassroots" while illuminating the relationship between national leaders and "local civic groups" (x).

In his introduction Fried traces the pre–Cold War history of patriotic pageantry. He reminds readers that organized pageantry, while not unknown in the nineteenth century, had, at best, received a mixed reception. Patriotic pageantry increased in the twentieth century as "the emergence of an industrialized, multi-ethnic society prompted Americans who fretted over these trends to seek appropriate rituals to domesticate alien influences" (4). The "foreign challenges" of "two world wars and their preliminaries" together with "threats, both real and imagined, from alien sources" increased "efforts to inspire greater
patriotic devotion” (5). When the Cold War began, “civic worriers,” comparing the level of patriotism in the country unfavorably to the level during World War II, sought public ways to celebrate American ideals as well as boost patriotism and civic responsibility to meet the communist threat. Likewise, business interests, alarmed by both the communist threat abroad and perceived attacks from “New Dealers, intellectuals, and a rudimentary consumers movement,” sought ways to inculcate “the virtues of capitalism” (20, 21).

The heart of the book is the chapters tracing the wide-ranging efforts these impulses produced. The “Freedom Train” of 1948–49 was, according to Fried, the “grandest effort at Cold War pageantry.” Its melding of “national government and elite initiatives with local energies” became a “model” for later efforts “to elevate American patriotism and Cold War consciousness” (28). Other efforts, which would enjoy, at best, temporary success, took a variety of forms. The VFW launched the annual “Loyalty Day” parade in an effort to “capture the May Day streets from the Left” (54). The belief that “loyalty” was best “inculcated through repeated observance” resulted in an attempt to “patriotize the American calendar” (87) by raising the status of older holidays, such as Flag Day, and creating new ones, such as Armed Forces Day. Likewise, seeing history as “cod-liver oil for civic irregularity” (99), many Americans tried to make historic commemorations, from the 350th anniversary of Jamestown to the Lincoln centennial and even the Civil War sesquicentennial, into public expressions of “the nation’s sense of its Cold War mission” (118). Finally, to dramatize the “feel of a day under communism” (67), there was the staging of a “communist” takeover of Mosinee, Wisconsin, on May Day in 1950, replicated about a month later in Hartley, Iowa.

By the seventies, most efforts at Cold War pageantry had proved difficult to sustain and disappointing to their sponsors. According to Fried, a “waning sense of emergency” and the weakening of the American communist movement to a point where “its public presence was negligible” eroded urgency (157, 158). A “changing culture” and awareness of a “generation gap” also made much of the cold-war pageantry seem “old fashioned” (157). Finally, the “advent of the oppositional politics of the 1960’s” resulted in a “rising cynicism” that challenged patriotic pageantry (151). In the end, though, Fried argues, it was “cherished aspects of American life,” particularly “pluralism, individualism, freedom of choice, abundance, [and] leisure” (158), that created competition for the time and energy of Americans and made it impossible to sustain a high level of patriotic pageantry.
This well-written, compact, and well-researched book offers a glimpse into a seldom-seen corner of the Cold War. Both specialists and general readers will profit from it.


REVIEWED BY ALAN I MARCUS, IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

At the time they wrote these books, Richard Horwitz and Paul Durrenberger were both based at the University of Iowa, but they don’t like each other. To be sure, some of their differences stem from personality. Horwitz judges Durrenberger officious and dismissive. Durrenberger apparently views Horwitz as scatterbrained and undisciplined. But the dislike goes far beyond those superficial designations. At the heart rests a potent disagreement about people, academia, farms, capitalism, and rural America. These fundamental cleavages are revealed in two books: Horwitz’s Hog Ties: Pigs, Manure, and Mortality in American Culture and Pigs, Profits, and Rural Communities, which Durrenberger edited with his Iowa colleague Kendall M. Thu. Although these two volumes were written independently of each other, they nonetheless form a neat union by which virtually all positions on the “hog question” are exposed. Ironically, the sole exception is that of the large corporate hoglots, which paradoxically purports to be the predominant focus of the books.

Of the two volumes, Durrenberger and Thu’s is by far the more conventional. Using traditional social science methodologies, they cover the tried and true topics—environment, quality of life, persistence of traditional rural community groupings and social structures, small farmsteads, incidences of disease and political power—to conclude that large-scale hoglots are an utter disaster, fit for neither man nor beast. Durrenberger and Thu’s solution is to use state power to outlaw or at least severely regulate and circumscribe these monolithic nuisances. While this part gets murky, Durrenberger and Thu apparently believe that the introduction of state authority would not only end large corporate hoglots but also go a long way toward restoring rural America to its nurturing and storied past.