The author forthrightly examines Hornaday’s limitations, including his prejudices relating to race and ethnicity. Hornaday’s prickly personality produced abrasive relationships as he “argued vehemently” over precise details of conservation tactics and strategy (159). Brought up as an Adventist in Iowa, Hornaday tended to see issues as moral absolutes, adopt unrelenting positions, and perceive opposition in personal terms. Offending some conservation leaders, Hornaday, with his “fiery, confrontational style, unbending moralism, and eagerness to challenge conservation organizations,” nonetheless effectively focused public attention on critical issues (182). By the 1930s, conservationists, tired of internecine warfare, sought to heal rifts in the movement.

Dehler succinctly assesses Hornaday’s legacy. Millions toured the New York Zoological Park during his tenure. The author argues that Aldo Leopold and others adapted parts of Hornaday’s outlook on moral responsibility. Hornaday’s positions indelibly shaped legislation, including the notion that wildlife refuges were not established exclusively for hunters. Ideas he debated on a national stage shaped refuges and conditions for migratory wildlife throughout the Midwest. Most significantly, Hornaday “expanded the scope of animals that deserved protection” beyond economically valuable game species toward a more general concept of wildlife, a harbinger of later endangered species protection (201). In 1929, Hornaday returned to the Ames campus to witness the unveiling of a plaque commemorating his contributions.

*The Most Defiant Devil* is exhaustively researched, engagingly written, and well integrated with memoirs and other histories. This outstanding biography provides perceptive insights into Hornaday’s motivations and his dynamic role.


If ever there was a moment for historians to move agricultural history out of its ghetto and into the history mainstream, surely this is it. In recent years, the Pollanesque crusade to “save” family farms and to eat small/local/organic has shoved to center stage a long-standing but decidedly fringe crusade to reform the nation’s food system. The campaign
is well intentioned but mired in impracticality (and thus often burdened with the charge of elitism). Food reformers, most of them urban, ignore the complex relations between farm and city, between agriculture and urbanization. The two are intimately, inextricably linked; to ponder either in isolation is a mistake of the first order.

Happily, Kendra Smith-Howard avoids that mistake in her first-rate survey of more than a century of milk in America. She notes that the “rhetoric” of today’s food reformers “stresses the existence of two agricultural systems—one local and self-sustaining and the other industrial and large-scale” (65). But, as her work demonstrates, for most of the past two centuries, American farmers have “operated on the local and national levels simultaneously.” That was particularly true in the early twentieth century, when many farmers viewed “the rise of national manufacturing and a mass market” not as “forces that eroded local rural economic vitality” but as paths “toward . . . economic independence,” paths that led, not surprisingly, straight to city tables (65).

Smith-Howard details the ways urban growth shaped perceptions of what milk was or should be and thus how farmers produced milk (and butter). Her engaging narrative delineates the connections among, for example, new ideas about breastfeeding (urban women), the impact of bovine tuberculosis (widespread and devastating to cow herds in early twentieth-century America), the adoption of pasteurization (to satisfy consumers’ demand for “fresh, pure, country” milk), and farmers’ struggles to cope with chronic labor shortages (as young people migrated to cities). The embrace of technological innovation down on the farm, she argues, was (and is) less corporate plot than the result of sensible business decisions made by farmers who understood that without cities, they had little reason to farm.

Smith-Howard also documents the ways Americans’ insistence on low food prices and their passion for the next, new, big (profitable) thing often inspire episodes of lunacy. Consider the history of recombinant bovine growth hormone (rBGH). This synthesized version of bovine somatotropin (BST) landed on the market in the 1980s. Manufacturers touted it as a tool for increasing milk output without the need for extra (expensive) feed. That sounded good in theory, especially to inflation-dogged consumers. But the supplement appeared at a moment when taxpayers were shelling out big bucks to farmers in an effort to downsize a bloated dairy and milk supply system. The last thing dairy farmers needed was a way to make more milk. (As is true of most foods in the United States, demand for milk rises and falls in response to demographics—a youth-skewed population means more milk drinkers—but also in relation to whatever food fads dominate at any given moment.
When milk, butter, or eggs, for example, are deemed “unhealthy,” demand drops; it rises again when consumers move on to the next food-avoidance fad.)

It is not only food reformers who could take a few tips from *Pure and Modern Milk*. Historians could learn from it, too. As the food crusade expands and gains clout, it is crucial that Americans think realistically about the future of their food system. Alas, historians, who could further that project, are missing in action. They’ve studiously (or so it seems) avoided digging into the histories of every major agricultural-related point of contention, whether the rise of confinement and manure lagoons or the introduction of antibiotics, artificial insemination, and genetically modified organisms. And agricultural history’s ghetto location means that few historians of urban America have pondered the infinite links that connect farm to city and back again. That, in turn, means that today’s food reformers are operating in a dangerous contextual vacuum. Here’s hoping that more historians follow Smith-Howard’s lead in tackling topics related to contemporary, and often contentious, political and social issues.


Reviewer Mary Swander is professor of English at Iowa State University and Poet Laureate of Iowa. Her list of books includes *Parsnips in the Snow: Talks with Midwestern Gardeners* (1990).

In an informative and engaging style, Lawrence L. Rettig gives a well-researched and fascinating account of the history of gardening in the Amanas from its early influences, including King Ludwig of Bavaria and the neighboring Meskwaki Indians, to the gradual shift from vegetable to flower gardens after the Great Change, when the Amana Colonies abandoned communal life during the Great Depression. Rettig takes readers on a tour of his own garden, which is listed in the Smithsonian’s *Archive of American Gardens*. Trellises and plants distinctive to the Amanas, seed saving, recipes, fermentation and preservation, and crafts are all included. Old-time black-and-white photographs capture both the hard utilitarian work and the bits of fun that went into Amana planting, cultivation, and harvesting rituals. Contemporary color photographs accent the beauty and grace of today’s flower gardens.

*Gardening the Amana Way* should be on the shelf of every gardener in Iowa and beyond the boundaries of the state. The book is written by