

local and therefore it is especially fit for historians who deal with individuals who form diasporas; it also helps historians for whom the remote link or contact might be more important than the close one.

Schreier's book is an excellent product of this "diasporic" turn, since unlike in most Jewish monographs on Maghrebi Jews up to the present day, he understands "local" in a very wide sense; he also dovetails the history of the Jews with that of the region's other inhabitants (Muslims and French Christians) and in fact contributes to the general history of Oran and its environs. At the same time he reminds us that Jews, often perceived as second-class residents in pre-industrial societies, do not become wealthy and arrive in high and commanding positions by following the roads taken by other members of their neighborhood and society of origin. Generally, the particular road taken by Jewish notables has to do with the diasporic character of the Jewish populations—a character that facilitates movement and communication among Jewish communities, but requires cultural heterogeneity and prepares Jews for intermediation roles and international commerce. The Jewish notable's political and economic rise to power often depended on their ability to find their way on the always-changing diasporic roads. Following Lasry's path from Morocco to Gibraltar, from Oran to Southern France, and so forth, therefore not only gives us clues to understanding his career but also opens before us diasporic dimensions that would have been otherwise closed.

YARON TSUR

Tel Aviv University (Emeritus)

PETER N. STEARNS. *Shame: A Brief History*. (History of Emotions.) Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2017. Pp. xiv, 163. Cloth \$95.00, paper \$24.95.

Peter N. Stearns, dean of American emotional historians, undertakes an enormous project in *Shame: A Brief History*. Stearns promises no less than a global analysis of shame from foraging societies to the present day, along with a summary of current psychological, anthropological, and sociological research on the topic—all this in just 140 pages of text! In the end, the book's impressionistic sketches of shame across cultures, chronological periods, and academic fields are thought provoking, if not always successful. But *Shame* delivers handsomely on a more limited agenda: defining changes in cultural expectations of shame in the United States from colonial times to the present.

Stearns begins with an analysis of current psychological theories of shame—a fraught task for any historian of shame. After all, psychology by its very nature looks for universal explanations of emotion, while for historians emotional experience is shaped by social expectations that are highly specific to individual cultures and times. Reflecting this tension between the disciplines, Stearns is critical of contemporary psychological

approaches that promote guilt (an internalized self-judgment of one's actions) as healthier than shame (a social judgment of an individual's worthiness). Stearns's main argument is that this negative view of shame is conditioned by modern Western cultural attitudes and neglects the consistent, and often beneficial, social uses of shame throughout recorded history.

In a brief analysis of the few hunter-gatherer communities that have survived into the modern era, Stearns notes that shame does not appear to have played a central or consistent role in such foraging societies. Rather, it was the beginning of agriculture (Stearns does not discuss herding societies) that afforded shame a key place in defining social norms across the globe. Shame appears everywhere in premodern agricultural societies: in the works of Plato, Aristotle, and Confucius, in the legal punishments doled out to adulterers and thieves, in the defenses of personal honor undertaken by duelists, and in the parenting manuals of the early modern period. So great was the desire to avoid shame that, between 1500 and 1650, the now-archaic English adjective "shamefast" was in wide use to describe a person who had taken pains to avoid acting shamefully (its antonym, "shameless," is still used today). Shame was invariably a painful experience, particularly for underprivileged groups, who were often viewed as "slightly shameful in and of themselves" and were thus expected to perform shame "as an emotional lubricant when encountering their betters" (30). However, shame was also an effective system for regulating social behavior. While the public shaming of criminals could be psychologically devastating, it also offered a clearer path to rehabilitation than does the modern criminal justice system: a shamed individual, after repenting, could be reintegrated into society once the shame had worn off.

So why did shame go out of fashion in Western societies? Here Stearns disagrees, in part, with Michel Foucault's analysis that shame disappeared as a form of social control when state surveillance, in the form of enhanced policing and long-term imprisonment, replaced it. For Stearns, the main cause of shame's decline was something else entirely. "Fundamentally," he writes, "the reconsideration of shame [in the nineteenth-century United States] reflected a prior cultural shift toward a greater valuation of individualism and individual dignity" (71). Shame became unacceptable, in other words, because it encouraged people to base their standards of behavior on the opinions of other people; in an increasingly individualistic culture, Americans preferred to develop a person's internal compass of right and wrong instead. Most Americans associate such a shift with the parenting techniques advocated by Benjamin Spock in the 1950s, but Stearns provides examples of this attitude from parenting manuals written by Lydia Maria Child and Catharine Beecher over a century earlier. The elimination of the stocks and of

public whippings, the decline of the dunce cap in American schools, and declining use of the word “shame” itself all reflected increased discomfort with the concept. Shame became relegated largely to the realms of athletics, business, and the military.

Beginning in the 1970s, however, attitudes toward shame became more muddled. Even as psychologists continued to reject shame as a destructive emotion and campaigns emerged to end the shaming of disabled and LGBTQ individuals, shame—both the word and the concept—suddenly became more popular. The public shaming of criminals regained a foothold in the justice system; “fat shaming” and “slut shaming” came into vogue. Conservatives embraced the shaming of the poor and of women seeking abortions. Most significantly, individuals making offensive public statements became the targets of shaming campaigns on both the left and the right—especially after the development of social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook. Such platforms created large, heterogeneous online communities where shame was once again used to enforce social conformity, even if plans to reintegrate shamed individuals into society did not seem as forthcoming as they had in earlier periods.

The early chapters of *Shame* contain a few missteps. Stearns’s evaluation of shame in Eastern societies concentrates almost exclusively on China and Japan and traffics in some outdated assumptions about the exaggerated role of shame in these societies, along with some regrettable descriptions of cultures such as the Balinese as “less complex” than those of China or Europe (21). There is enough slipperiness between “Western culture” and American culture that the latter is sometimes made to stand in for the former, eliding the differences between American concepts of shame and those in other countries. It might have been more effective to focus exclusively on the American case, discussing shame in premodern societies and other cultures only by way of comparison.

Still, the central argument of *Shame* is a brilliant and incisive piece of cultural criticism, on par with some of Stearns’s best work. Readers wondering why Americans decry the use of shame while incessantly performing it will find Stearns’s volume an indispensable and convincing explanation. Arguments about shame, Stearns shows us, are really about the role of the individual in society; no question in American history has been more central to debates over American identity.

JEREMY C. YOUNG
Dixie State University

ALAN MAYNE. *Slums: The History of a Global Injustice*. London: Reaktion Books, 2017. Pp. 360. Cloth \$29.95.

The word “slum” has been in English usage since the early nineteenth century. Alan Mayne’s *Slums: The*

History of a Global Injustice traces a colloquial origin, finding the term described in dictionaries of vulgar language and slang around that time. These descriptions imply that “slum” referred not only to inadequate physical standards of dwellings but also to the lowly if not criminal reputation of the inhabitants. Mayne convincingly traces a continuity of this connotation through to present day uses of “slum,” whether in policy or in political discourse. Mayne finds in the term “slum” a deliberate misrepresentation or deceit, an inference of disorder, and a stereotyping and othering, all of which discount any contribution individuals or communities in areas labeled “slums” may make in economic and social terms. Further, the use of the term has time and again turned good intentions and sympathy into patronage. Key to Mayne’s narrative is that such sympathy is combined with repulsion, and repulsion in turn draws attraction. Repulsion-attraction leads to a variety of ways in which the outsider gaze, in Mayne’s observation, is best captured by the term “slumming.” This took the form of diversion or entertainment for the middle classes of the nineteenth century. However, as Mayne shows, slumming also applies to contemporary tourism, to journalism, to research missions, and not least to politically legitimizing activities—prominent people’s visits to ordinary places labeled as “slums.”

While repulsion triggers curiosity (and may replace complacency and indifference), it also informs spatial decision-making. This takes the form of individuals’ self-segregating investment decisions in the urban housing market. It also involves planners, urban managers, and policymakers who, if not aiming to demolish and obliterate slums altogether, cordon them off and separate and segregate rather than accepting them as being home to legitimate and ambioned, though constrained, communities that both shape the city of the future and have a legitimate right to access to urban amenity.

“Slum” is a mindset that endured the political changes from colonialism to independence. Mayne traces it even within the United Nations (UN). The narrative in this book returns time and again to the UN Millennium Development Goals. With this initiative, the UN revived the term “slum,” shifting its meaning into more positive terrain but failing both to displace deep-seated connotations and to prevent some of the largest slum-clearance programs in human history. Thus the “slum mindset” overshadows evidence of the diversity, economic activity, livelihoods, and popular production of housing. Mayne shows how UN-Habitat, Cities Alliance, and also the international NGO Shack/Slum Dwellers International have challenged the deceptions inherent in the term “slum,” but at times they have also been complicit in these “slum deceptions.”

Mayne has mined historical archives, finding an overwhelming and recurring prevalence of a damning slum and inevitably anti-slum discourse, both steeped