

interfaith couples, which is a sign of the “tensions between American individualism and the search for community” (7).

Other than being descriptive, Schaefer Riley also seeks to prescribe a balance to strengthen both religion and marriage. Considering the higher rates of divorce, unhappiness, and anxiety experienced by interfaith couples, Schaefer Riley recommends that American society open up civil discussions of religion so that couples can feel more comfortable “forging marriages around common beliefs,” which is what sociologists identify as the most important element of a successful relationship (14).

Schaefer Riley also considers the attitudes and perspective of the clergy, who are often the first ones to negotiate and draw boundaries of an interfaith marriage. Interviews with Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox, Jewish, Muslim, Mormon, and Native American clergy reveal a similar tension between the impulse to accommodate a pluralist culture and preserve a religious heritage. While couples preparing for an interfaith marriage are concerned with “comfort,” many clergy are concerned with the legacy of faith. Through these interviews, Schaefer Riley begins to understand how definitions of marriage are indeed malleable.

Ultimately, Schaefer Riley challenges her reader to take religion more seriously in discussions about marriage—not to take religion as a mere “immutable personal trait,” but to understand how it makes our values specific and can help us avoid the anxieties that arrive with competing loyalties (205). Crafted with humanized examples and defended by some intriguing data, Schaefer Riley makes a fascinating and nuanced argument that emphasizes the role of parents and grandparents in opening up this public dialogue. While many may disagree with Schaefer Riley’s recommendations (that she is sometimes quick to make), this study is sure to spark further scholarship on the origins, effects, and promise of interfaith marriages in America.

Jared Griffin

Kodiak College, University of Alaska Anchorage

TOUGH ON HATE?: The Cultural Politics of Hate Crimes. By Clara S. Lewis. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. 2013.

Although gay college student Matthew Shepard’s murder was not legally deemed a hate crime, Shepard has become the paradigmatic hate crime victim, his image so often invoked that the federal legislation against hate crimes is named after him and lynching victim James Byrd, Jr. Though their murders raised national consciousness about bias-based violence, Clara S. Lewis argues in *Tough on Hate?: The Cultural Politics of Hate Crimes*, the media, politicians, and the general public have used their images in ways that paradoxically decry “hate” while undermining “our collective sense of culpability” (25) so that we cannot act on the ongoing structural oppression that incubates hate.

Lewis posits that our well-meaning narratives about hate crimes demand a post-difference citizenship, “whereby members of historically marginalized groups and their allies are given access to public support by condoning post-difference ideology” (91). Victims of hate crimes (or their family members) must deny their differ-

ence, which otherwise challenges ideas about national unity. Victims of anti-Arab/Muslim hate crimes must stress their love of America and Islam's non-threatening nature. Racial minorities must be "race blind," relegating race-based violence to the Civil Rights era (except in the exceptional case at hand). Victims of homophobic violence cannot be sexual but, like Shepard, childlike and from "spectacularly normal" backgrounds (96). Yet victims are selected precisely because they are not normative; their religious, ethnic, racial, and sexual identities place them outside of the norm. In a post-difference world, these identities don't matter—except that they do, sometimes to the point of death.

By erasing the very difference that inspired the crime, the public again victimizes with its "overwhelming desire to prove that we, the people within the community where the crime occurred, are better than the crime" (3). Hate crime narratives focus on the normality of the victim. (How tempting it is, as Matthew Shepard's mother Judy speaks, to think, "That could have been my son!" Except that it wouldn't ever be your son unless your son is gay). They also place the perpetrators outside of society, as "loners" on the "fringe." The public's desire to depict perpetrators, who are actually "disturbingly conformist" (85), as abnormal is motivated by the same need to view such crimes as abnormal rather than as "an expression of extended histories of often state-sponsored violence against minority groups and of broader contemporary social forces" (60). If victims really are different and perpetrators really are conformists, we could no longer see these crimes as unthinkable but as violent, predictable consequences of oppression.

Lewis skillfully analyzes the rhetoric around hate crimes, examining news coverage, political hearings, legislation, and documentary films, and deploying theories from diverse disciplines in a way that will engage American Studies scholars. Unfortunately, it draws from a limited number of high-profile crimes—for example, no anti-Semitic crimes are examined. That said, it is easy enough for readers to imagine how the rich critiques that Lewis articulates here could be applied to other hate crimes and, more importantly, to our responses to them.

Rebecca Barrett-Fox

Arkansas State University

ABORTION IN THE AMERICAN IMAGINATION: Before Life and Choice, 1880–1940. By Karen Weingarten. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. 2014.

A solid work of American Studies scholarship should be truly interdisciplinary at the same time it strives to challenge its audience to scrutinize a deeply ingrained ideology. Karen Weingarten's *Abortion in the American Imagination* does this with verve. By drawing a trajectory from Anthony Comstock's attempts to regulate morality in the late-nineteenth century, to popular fiction of the early-twentieth century, to abortion's ties with economics and labor philosophy, Weingarten demonstrates that the contemporary abortion discourse of "life" and "choice" reveals that, despite crossing disciplines, the issue has landed in the nebulous realm of morality: "[...] the use of the terms *life* and *choice* is caught in liberal American ideals of individuality,

Copyright of American Studies (00263079) is the property of Mid-American Studies Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.