Americans constituted a protected group under the Fourteenth Amendment.

One of the book’s most poignant and powerful aspects is found in Blanton’s description of the heavy personal price that Sanchez paid for his efforts to secure justice for Mexican Americans. Sanchez was marginalized by colleagues who devalued his work and punished by university officials who consistently refused to raise his salary. He also suffered from severe health problems for many years.

In summary, Blanton’s study of George Sanchez is an excellent book. It constitutes a comprehensive and first-rate examination of one of the most important figures in Mexican American civil rights history. It presents a compelling history of the life and struggles of George Sanchez as he sought to help establish the rights of Mexican Americans.

George A. Martínez
Southern Methodist University Dedman School of Law


Over the last decade, studies of the Cold War have multiplied and diversified, with cultural, local, and non-Western perspectives taking a critical, center stage. Masuda Hajimu’s ambitious Cold War Crucible, a global study of the early manifestations of this conflict, joins the lively debate. His focus on the “imagined reality” of the Cold War makes a particularly valuable contribution in suggesting that epistemological frames of a worldwide rivalry functioned in shaping its ontological effects in local contexts.

In broadest terms, Masuda aims to reverse the relationship between the discourse and reality of the Cold War. In other words, he argues that home-grown fantasies of this global conflict transformed it into a concrete, on-the-ground reality. This thesis is an important historiographical corrective insofar as it highlights the power of popular perceptions, rather than assuming the omnipotence of elite discourses and official policies. A related payoff of Masuda’s bottom-up approach is his convincing point that pre-existing histories of colonialism and World War II inflected individual efforts for empowerment. In Chapter 1, for example, he shows how postwar demands by disenfranchised social groups (i.e., African Americans, Japanese Marxists, and anti-nationalist Chinese) were commonly
equated with “pro-communist” movements. As a result, perceived threats to the status quo helped concretize emergent realities of the Cold War in these three nation-states. In similar fashion, Chapter 2 reveals that fears about the possibility of another global confrontation among newly liberated Koreans gradually solidified a collective sense of capitalist “us” versus communist “them,” and vice versa.

In the following section, Masuda seeks to invert the commonsensical relationship between policymakers and so-called ordinary people during the Korean War, a pivotal conflict that helped instantiate the Cold War. Chapter 3, for example, uses American editorials to suggest that popular opinion tended to trump official policy in terms of its anti-communist virulence, which members of Congress used as political fodder for international campaigns. In Chapter 4, Masuda locates similar dynamics in communist China where the Korean War served as “a test case for the CCP’s legitimacy and identity” (p. 143). Here and elsewhere throughout this section, one wonders about the specific stance of individual newspapers and the media’s broader function in fantasy-making as well as its relationship to the two social groups analyzed by Masuda. A more precise definition and analysis of the concept of ordinary people would have further elucidated the complex subjectivities of individuals who expressed feelings about their politicized surroundings. In Chapters 5 and 6, it is also unclear the degree to which American and Chinese media, respectively, represented popular sentiments about Koreans and Chinese as Soviet dupes, for example, or Americans as inveterate imperialists.

Finally, although certainly not denying the destructive effects of the Cold War, a topic covered in the third and final section on the simultaneity of anti-communist campaigns, Masuda’s analytical insistence on perceived realities has a tendency to downplay another “truth” captured by scholars such as Heonik Kwon. In The Other Cold War (2010), Kwon persuasively argued that the long Korean War (1948–1955) and subsequent anti-communist battles in Vietnam and across Asia subjected the peoples of this part of the world to a comparatively high degree of violence and alienation. In these cases of Hot War, it is difficult to agree with Masuda’s post-structuralist claim that such conflict “existed not because it was there but because people thought that it existed” (p. 2; emphasis in original). Nor can anyone familiar with the devastating effects of the ongoing confrontation on the Korean peninsula, the historical fulcrum of Masuda’s provocative thesis, concur with his blithe observation that “the Cold War seems to be an event of a past long gone” (p. 2).
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