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Unequal Desires adds an important theoretical component for understanding racism within desire industries. Brooks develops a connection between racism, classism, and sexism by examining the influence of space and capital for sex workers. Her findings are increasingly relevant as the service sector and sex industries experience an influx of minority workers. Yet, I would have liked to see an analysis of the mechanisms by which erotic capital operates. Brooks convincingly demonstrates that erotic capital can have significant outcomes on life chances, yet she does not provide an analysis of why outcomes vary among equally devalued minority workers. Her data indicate that some devalued women of color are able to benefit in customer–dancer exchanges of capital despite their low level of erotic capital, whereas other women of color experience labeling and exploitation. An expanded discussion of racial passing and the individual marketing of erotic capital by devalued workers may highlight the interpersonal mechanisms by which erotic capital operates differently for women of color employed in strip clubs. Including an analysis of the mechanisms by which workers can alter erotic capital may benefit our understanding of how it can reproduce or alleviate inequality. In addition, the book would benefit from better organization. The disconnected discussion and analyses of erotic capital at the three research sites make the links between several of the findings unclear. This might have been remedied by a strong conclusive chapter; however, Brooks provides only a short, four-page conclusion. Nonetheless, feminist and inequality scholars concerned with job stratification may benefit from this short read.
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The Colorado Coalfield War of 1913–1914 is well known to many labor historians, having been the subject of numerous books and articles by historians and sociologists of the American working class. From 1997 to 2002, however, a group of archaeologists calling themselves the Ludlow Collective initiated the Colorado Coalfield War Archaeology Project (CCWAP), conducting excavations both at the site of the famous Ludlow tent colony and in the nearby Colorado Fuel and Iron Company (CF&I) town of Berwind. This project, which was undertaken with the blessing and cooperation of the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA), has produced an impressive amount of scholarship on the politics of archaeology, memory, and working-class heritage by various members of the Ludlow Collective. With the publication of The Archaeology of Class War, however, two of the leading members of the Collective, Karin Larkin and Randall McGuire, have finally
assembled in one volume representative samples of both the CCWAP’s theoretical contributions and the results of archaeological fieldwork in Ludlow and Berwind.

Larkin and McGuire begin the volume with three introductory chapters that set the stage for the remaining contributions. Although three chapters may at first seem to be a bit too much of an introduction, the editors do a fine job by focusing on each chapter. In Chapter 1, Larkin and McGuire provide an overview of the project, emphasizing its origins and its theoretical and political commitments. McGuire in particular is well known within the field of archaeology for his advocacy of Marxist approaches, so it is not surprising that he would have sought out a subject such as the Colorado Coalfield War for a project. Larkin and McGuire do an admirable job of explaining the Ludlow Collective’s adherence to a praxis of archaeology as political action without sounding dogmatic. They also discuss the project’s relationship with the UMWA, specifically District 22 and Local 9856 in Trinidad, Colorado, the organizers of the annual memorial vigil at the site of the Ludlow Massacre. Finally, Larkin and McGuire provide a historiographical overview to situate the CCWAP within the ongoing field of Colorado Coalfield War studies.

In Chapter 2, McGuire offers an overview of the historical events of the Colorado Coalfield War, including the larger contexts of early twentieth-century capitalism in the American west and the Colorado coal industry. Portions of this chapter read like a textbook and McGuire does not offer any new information, but for readers who are not already familiar with the Colorado Coalfield War, the chapter serves as a valuable introduction. In Chapter 3, Larkin provides an in-depth introduction to the CCWAP, including extended discussions of research design and methods. Although this chapter can be tedious in its attention to detail at times, historians may benefit from the education in standard archaeological research methods.

Chapters 4 through 9 provide examples of analyses that came out of the archaeological fieldwork in Ludlow and Berwind. Several of these analyses overlap, but all are excellent examples of the current trend in historical archaeology to combine archival and archaeological research with contextual analyses of space, place, and context to produce a holistic interpretation of the data. Margaret Wood focuses on spatial, documentary, and archaeological evidence to argue that the CF&I and miners’ families offered competing visions of the values and meanings of both American democracy and domesticity in Berwind following the Coalfield War, when the CF&I under John Rockefeller, Jr implemented its Industrial Representation Plan. Sarah Chicone focuses on the ideological meanings behind the architecture of both vernacular and company-provided workers’ housing, whereas Michael Jacobson offers a spatial analysis of the Ludlow Tent Colony. Amie Gray analyzes material culture with the goal of examining ethnic differences within the tent colony, ultimately placing her analysis within the context of progressive reform efforts aimed at the Americanization of immigrants. Claire Horn examines the use of proprietary medicines in the tent colony, whereas Summer Moore focuses on the material culture of childhood at Ludlow.

Chapters 10–12 focus on the politics of archaeology and working-class heritage, taking the results of archaeological research at Ludlow and Berwind and moving toward a political praxis of social justice. Mark Walker examines the intersection of archaeology and working-class memory at Ludlow, whereas Bonnie Clark and Eleanor Conlin Casella discuss the nuances of teaching about class conflict using the CCWAP. Philip Duke and Dean Saitta close the volume with a brief discussion of the various public outreach components of the CCWAP.
As an example of a successful research project in historical archaeology and also a record of perhaps the first archaeological research project to explicitly include progressive political action as part of its praxis, *The Archaeology of Class War* is a valuable contribution to the field of historical archaeology. But what about the book’s contribution to working-class history? In their first chapter, Larkin and McGuire provide a critique of previous scholarship on the Colorado Coalfield War. They suggest, as is common when historical archaeologists feel that they have to defend the value of their work, that the major contribution of the CCWAP to Colorado Coalfield War studies is the ability of archaeology to examine daily life in both Berwind and the Ludlow Tent Colony. I think that many historians might be surprised to learn that the documentary record is not conducive to research into daily life, because they have been doing just this kind of research for several decades. What is different between archaeological and historical research is the kinds of evidentiary trails that their respective practitioners follow to build arguments about the past and present; the end results are often strikingly similar. The members of the Ludlow Collective have no need to defend their work; the results speak for themselves.
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If Eleanor Roosevelt was the woman most publicly associated with the New Deal, then Frances Perkins, who served as Secretary of Labor during the entire term of Franklin D. Roosevelt, was the woman behind much of FDR’s domestic agenda. That is Downey’s thesis, and she easily proves it. Perkins, the first woman to hold a cabinet position, shaped such initiatives as the National Recovery Administration (NRA), the centerpiece of Roosevelt’s First Hundred Days; the Fair Labor Standards Act which, among other things, established the minimum wage; and Social Security – the blueprint for America’s welfare state. Although Perkins is ‘virtually unknown’ today, her legacy continues: ‘About 44 million people collect Social Security checks each month; millions receive unemployment and worker’s compensation or the minimum wage; others get to go home after an eight hour day’ (397).

Three themes permeate Downey’s biography. The first is Perkins’ complex persona. She emerged, at a fairly early age, as a champion of social reform. Hailing from a once wealthy family, Perkins was educated at Mount Holyoke College, dwelled at Hull House, and became a social worker and advocate for workers’ safety, especially after the Triangle Shirtwaist Fire. But she was no stereotypical do-gooder. Perkins was, in fact, something of an operator; she concealed her one-time membership in the Socialist Party, shaved a