and the hamlet of Wounded Knee on the Pine Ridge Reservation, Davis argues, it was also being fought by everyday people in K–12 classrooms. If decolonization was a matter of laws, it was also a matter of learning. Survival Schools features an insightful treatment of curriculum, student work, and internal decision making and debate to drive this point home.

The third and final level of Davis’s contribution extends from the persuasive way she connects the Twin Cities survival schools to the global indigenous rights movement in her final chapter and conclusion. This is an important addition to her analysis, making it clear that if this book is a case study of two schools, it is also one part of a much larger story of indigenous peoples’ reassertion of sovereignty and self-determination since the 1960s. Well written and exhaustively researched, Survival Schools adds a vital new perspective on a transformative moment in American Indian history.
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A former high-end vegetarian chef and current scholar of food studies, Charlotte Biltekoff is uniquely positioned to write a social and cultural history of eating right in the United States. Given the scope of Biltekoff’s study, it is impressive that the book successfully presents a unified story that illustrates threads of commonality and divergence from the late nineteenth century to the present. Biltekoff shows that while healthy-eating movements have changed in focus and methods, they are united through one great commonality: the attachment of social values to dietary advice aimed at creating good citizens through moral suasion.

Biltekoff focuses on four particular ideologies, beginning with the late nineteenth-century rise of domestic sciences that were simultaneously “moral” and “quantitative” in approach to food reform (p. 14). The narrative then jumps to developments during World War II when dietary self-improvement took on the added dimension of patriotic citizenship. Throughout the narrative, Biltekoff positions the notion of dietary health as a constructed ideology available to the privileged few, and she turns a particularly critical eye toward the writings of the nutritionism movement of the 1970s and 1980s. The book concludes with a consideration of the social implications inherent in the current alarm over the so-called obesity epidemic and the social shaming connected to those deemed overweight.

The book’s greatest shortcoming reflects the narrative’s success. Simply put, the book was so enjoyable that more development was warranted. Most notably, the book skips from the Progressive Era to World War II and the U.S. government’s attempts to define domestic service and food consumption as patriotic acts. The book, however, offers little consideration of governmental attempts to shape patriotic consumption during World War I, a seemingly natural bridge to connect the progressives with efforts during World War II. Also missing are discussions of other ideals, such as convenience and speed of preparation, that competed with the idea of eating right in the 1950s and 1960s. Were these values also a way for society to define eating right? If so, how did the proliferation of other food movements challenge the right-eating ideals that Biltekoff justifiably emphasizes?

Biltekoff’s narrative effectively traces the connections and variances between the movements studied in the book, and in many ways her compelling writing makes up for the gaps in time. Still, the book’s thesis would have benefitted from a more comprehensive treatment of other nutritional-advice movements. These are, however, minor quibbles born out of an appreciation for an otherwise-magnificent book that successfully accomplishes the oft-difficult balance between academic rigor, general accessibility, and social advocacy. Biltekoff’s book is not preachy in its activism but rather provides a compelling and convincing argument that leads readers to conclude that the notion of eating right is fraught with complications, contradictions, and social aspersions. This is
an important book that will find particular enthusiasm among historians of food, fat studies, science, medicine, and consumption.
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In Slavery, Abortion, and the Politics of Constitutional Meaning Justin Buckley Dyer explores the analogy of abortion and slavery from historical, political, and philosophical perspectives. In the 1857 Dred Scott v. Sandford decision the Supreme Court elevated the property interests of slave owners above all other rights, including the human rights of slaves. In Roe v. Wade (1973), Dyer argues, the Court similarly elevated a woman’s right to choose an abortion above all other rights, including the rights of the fetus. Scott v. Sandford has long been invoked by prolife activists as a call to arms against abortion rights. Dyer agrees that it is appropriate for prolife activists to claim the legacy of the antislavery movement in their battle against legalized abortion.

The Fourteenth Amendment overruled Scott v. Sandford and established rights for the newly freed slaves that were enforceable against the states. That amendment’s broad language has proven to be a vehicle for identifying other fundamental rights, including abortion rights. Dyer effectively describes the history and constitutional politics of the Supreme Court’s substantive due process rulings, and the historical parallels between the antislavery and prolife movements.

In the Roe v. Wade decision Justice Harry Blackmun claimed that there is no consensus on when life begins, and he maintained that there was no widespread condemnation of abortion in this country until the late nineteenth century. Dyer examines the legal strategy of the case’s attorneys and accuses them of engaging in “law office history.” He argues that nineteenth-century antiabortion laws were aimed at protecting the life of the fetus and not at restricting women’s rights. However, Dyer fails to acknowledge the significance of the many restrictions on women’s rights that did exist in the nineteenth century, including the lack of reproductive rights for the slaves who were to benefit from the Fourteenth Amendment.

Dyer also explores the history of abortion politics in the twentieth century. Legal historians such as Reva Siegel have written extensively about the role of the women’s movement and its claims of liberty and equality in convincing the Court to find for a fundamental right to choose contraception and abortion. However, Dyer does not engage that history in his discussion of abortion politics.

In the last two chapters, Dyer turns to the underlying philosophical debate about abortion, exploring the analogy of slavery and abortion. He argues that there is no principled reason for treating a fetus as a nonperson, lacking the protection of law. In the slavery-abortion analogy, pregnant women are to the aborted fetus as slaveholders are to slaves. Nonetheless, Dyer fails to address the arguments of those who have stressed women’s interests of equality and liberty in his otherwise detailed analysis of the numerous scholars and ethicists on both sides of the abortion debate.

Fundamentally, Dyer argues, the question is “who counts as a member of our political and moral community” (p. 157). His book may leave readers wondering about the extent to which women count as part of the slavery analogy in prolife politics.
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Living just around the corner from the Brooklyn Museum, I have seen the feminist art installation The Dinner Party many times, and