Danner's narrative about this case feels current, because it treats long-standing aspirations and problems within the environmental movement as it developed after World War II, and because many of the issues that dogged advocacy for conservation in the North Cascades in the 1960s still challenge us today.

Laura J. Feller, National Park Service (retired)

Curating Revolution: Politics on Display in Mao's China by Denise Y. Ho. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. 1 + 308 pp.; illustrations, notes, bibliography, index; clothbound, $112.00; paperbound, $32.00; eBook, $24.00.

Denise Y. Ho's book, impeccably grounded in archival and oral research, analyzes how certain objects of Mao-era politics (1949–79), glossed as revolution, came to be organized for exhibition in local- and national-level forms. We have long known that Mao's China was keen on bringing the communist revolution and its associated shifting politics into everyday life. This was done through direct campaigns and mobilizations, song and dance, propaganda posters, and slogans; it was done in literature and drama as well as on residential blackboards that transmitted crucial directives while keeping track of community affairs. Ho's examples of exhibitionary culture in Shanghai span a range of other possibilities for the visually materialized nature of Mao-era politics in its many ubiquitous forms. She reveals how material objects were made to take on meaning through their contextualization into various narrative strategies, and she explores how narrative strategies were bent to fit the materialized realities of ever-shifting political life itself. This constitutes for her a modal tension. The problem of the relation of narrative to materiality is an old one—scholars must deal with it as a matter of professional hazard, either implicitly or explicitly. Ho finds a way to make this old problem somewhat new, even while her use of the term "curation" falls a little flat.

Chapter 1 is an exploration into how the search for and designation of the First Party Congress site was pursued in the early 1950s. Hardly straightforward and always riven by contradiction, Ho demonstrates how this fraught process was resolved in favor of displaying objects that conformed to the "red line" narrative confirming Mao's centrality to the Chinese Communist Party formation and development. Unsurprising in its narrative findings, the chapter nevertheless makes for interesting historical reading. Chapter 2 examines how the transformation of the Fangua Lane shantytown became a story of urban renewal in the name of the proletariat (in unmarked contrast to 1990s-era Shanghai urban renewal in the name of the market). That pre-1949 substandard housing was torn down and rebuilt, and that certain families were moved back in to enjoy modernized socialist infrastructure is a utopian story of worker-centered urbanism combined with inevitable disappointments about how partial that utopia in fact was and could ever have been. It is not startling that exhibitions on Fangua Lane rendered it synonymous with the promise of the proletarian socialist state, although Ho renders the story

well. Chapter 3 investigates the "love science and eliminate superstition" campaigns of the early 1960s aimed primarily at school-aged children in an attempt to pry them loose from "feudal" beliefs and to inculcate into them commitment to the omnipotence of science. As Ho comments, "By making science and superstition opposites, the exhibition made them mutually exclusive" (132). This is not a novel insight—it is integral to all enlightenment theories—and how "curation" contributes conceptually rather than merely descriptively is not clear, but again the story is effectively told.

Chapter 4 takes up the mid-1960s movement for class education through which each individual was to be compelled to think of themselves as a collective classed subject. This political consciousness-raising presented, as Ho documents, the problem of how to exhibit class solidarity and class treachery, when the designated main threat of "peaceful evolution" was difficult to put on display, because the nature of the process it names is characterized by deviousness and secrecy. The resultant compromises, Ho demonstrates, became the stuff of cultural revolutionary attack a short while later. In chapter 5, Ho narrates how the Red Guards celebrated their successes at ferreting out and smashing class privilege, understood as the threat of peaceful evolution, in their mostly haphazard curatorial practices, through which they amassed household objects seized from "bourgeois" families, and piled them up for public viewing. Reminiscent of land reform practices when landlord abundance was arrayed for peasant inspection, these performative object parades focused on the hidden and the covert. Ho beautifully focuses on this in her discussion of the false-bottomed teakettle—an everyday object hiding within it traces of prerevolutionary bourgeois life: gold, land deeds, etc.—which came to stand in for every concealed class ill under attack. This is the chapter in which "curation" starts to make conceptual sense and also frays as, during the Cultural Revolution, the affective aspects of revolutionary desire came to be perfectly matched to their material exhibitionary manifestations, and yet this convergence is at best accidental.

Chapter 6 takes us through the distinctions made between the "four olds"—old customs, habits, culture and ideas—and *wenwu*, cultural relics, born of the Cultural Revolutionary injunction to destroy the former while (sometimes) protecting the latter. The Shanghai Museum is the institutional site whose curators collected antiquity. This is curation in its traditional sense. As Ho makes clear, the museum's task was always tension-filled and rarely dodged political bullets, yet particularly after 1967–68, the museum and the Wenwu Small Group managed to force *wenwu* protection upon an impressive roster of items.

The book is without doubt well-researched and well-written. My lingering question revolves around the untheorized term "curation." What does Ho mean by "curating"? Is there something crucial at stake in her usage? It appears not. In the introduction, Ho gestures towards a descriptive explanation (see page 21), and then at the end of the book Ho is explicit, "This book uses the word 'curating' to refer to all stages of putting on an exhibition . . . Thinking of curating as a process illuminates

how propaganda was produced and consumed in Mao's China" (249). The theoretical work "curation" does is thus negligible; it has no heft. It connotes collecting and displaying. How might we make it do more work? I speculate based upon analogy: today's trendy zeal for curation encourages us to colonize every corner of our affective lives through the marketplace. We are invited these days to "curate" our lives: websites, blogs, occasionally brick-and-mortar locations urge us to acquire, hanker for, or seek after objects that will complete or enhance our actual and digital existences. Yet Mao-era curation is no marketized affair. Thus, we might ask: what could "curating" as a form of desire-stimulation do for thinking about Mao-era politics? A possible conclusion: *If* curation were about affect and desire—in the more trendy sense used today—and *if* curation was central to Mao-era revolution *in an unmarketized sense*, then the regression between Mao-era curating and the museum practices discussed in chapter 6 become clear. That is, the museum engages in curation in the traditional mode of collecting and displaying, which manages to detach itself from Mao-era mass revolutionary affect. It points to the post-Mao relocation of curation to the dispassionate realm of expertise, thus releasing curation from everyday revolutionary necessity and freeing it to assume its expert and, later, its marketized guises. This is not Ho's conclusion. But if my speculation is at all correct, then, historically, Ho seems to imply that revolutionary politics were lived only or primarily in exhibitionary ("curatorial") form, before the "proper" order of the world—expert collecting and market colonization—was restored. This type of argument would constitute a bold theoretical wager. More's the pity that with her closure onto historical normativity and refusal to theorize, this promising book was not more ambitious in its claims.

Rebecca Karl, New York University

The Place of Stone: Dighton Rock and the Erasure of America's Indigenous Past by Douglas Hunter. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2017. xiii + 324 pp.; notes, bibliography, index; clothbound, $34.95; eBook, $25.99.

In the early nineteenth century, Joseph Smith claimed that he unearthed golden plates in a New York hillside that told the story of a Lost Tribe of Israel's journey to America. In the early twentieth century, rural Minnesotans used a stone with a runic inscription to argue that Norsemen visited the region long before the voyages of Columbus. Even today, the popularity of television shows such as *Ancient Aliens* and *America Unearthed* demonstrate that many are still on the lookout for alternative theories about pre-Columbian America. Douglas Hunter's book, *The Place of Stone*, uses the history of the Dighton Rock to explain the motivations behind the centuries-long belief that North America was once populated by more than the indigenous people encountered by Europeans during the contact period.

The Dighton Rock is a forty-ton boulder originally situated in an intertidal zone in the Taunton River of southeastern Massachusetts, but is now enshrined in a small