learn a language intersect with the culturally and linguistically specific factors in each child's upbringing? Must members of a speech community be aware that they are members of such a community?). Each chapter provides a rich overview of central topics in linguistic anthropology by devoting considerable attention to an expansive range of ethnographic case studies. Ahearn's own research on the emergence of love letter-writing and gender transformations in Nepal is highlighted throughout the text. Additionally, Ahearn draws on examples from her teaching, everyday life, and popular debates to enrich the discussion of abstract concepts. The book's most distinguishing characteristic is the balance it strikes between presenting key terms in the field, tracing the intellectual development of these concepts, and, most importantly, foregrounding the research of contemporary linguistic anthropologists. The result is a book that will resonate widely with linguistic anthropologists associated with differing intellectual traditions and students who are interested in learning about them.

Tables and figures are often used to illustrate more quantitative or technical linguistic issues (e.g., honorifics, noun classes, etc.). The book also includes multiple syndicated cartoons featuring metalinguistic discourse throughout the chapters, as well as images from Ahearn's fieldwork. These graphic representations contribute to the engaging nature of the text, which successfully avoids the overly didactic tendencies of some of its counterparts. Notably, the book does not devote separate chapters to topics in structural linguistics; instead, it incorporates discussions, analyses, and examples of syntax, semantics, phonology, and morphology into each chapter's focus on a specific sociocultural domain. This approach illustrates linguistic anthropologists' commitment to the joint analysis of sociocultural and linguistic structures.

For the past three years I have used *Living Language* as the central text in a large undergraduate lecture that serves as an introduction to linguistic anthropology. My students have remarked that the book is highly accessible, instructive, and appealing. My graduate teaching assistants for this course have also noted the book's clarity and the comprehensiveness of its contemporary overview of the field. I pair the book with Blum's *Making Sense of Language: Readings in Culture and Communication*, which nicely complements *Living Language* by providing longer versions of many of the classic pieces that Ahearn presents in an abbreviated form (e.g., Labov's "The Social Stratification of (r) in New York City Department Stores," Heath's "What No Bedtime Story Means," Whorf's "The Relation of Habitual Thought and Behavior to Language," etc.). *Living Language* is a rich pedagogical tool and point of reference for instructors and students.

Within four-field approaches to the discipline of anthropology, linguistic anthropology is often viewed as a highly technical, micro-socially oriented subfield whose theories and methods are accessible and relevant only to those who are specifically interested in analyzing linguistic form. Outside of anthropology and language-oriented disciplines (e.g., (socio)linguistics, communication, etc.), linguistic anthropology is largely unnoticed; this invisibility or unintelligibility is unfortunate and, at times, ironic. Ahearn's *Living Language* engages these multiple audiences by making a compelling case for the conceptual, analytical, and methodological power of linguistic anthropology. This book is deserving of high praise for managing to capture the field's nuance and complexity, while doing so in a way that is accessible, timely, and of interest both to specialists and nonspecialists alike.

Articulate while Black: Barack Obama, Language, and Race in the U.S. *H. Samy Alim* and *Geneva Smitherman*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012. xviii+205 pp.

ARTHUR K. SPEARS
The City University of New York
arspears1676@gmail.com

This book is quite remarkable for its range and depth. Though it is conspicuously about Obama, it is serviceable as an introduction to African American English (AAE), suffused with discussions of language, race, grammar, and education. It is in every sense, with respect to content, an academic volume, full of information appropriate for linguists (not specializing in AAE) while at the same time admirably readable for nonspecialists, notably beginning students in the appropriate anthropology and linguistics courses. In regard to its suitability as an introduction to AAE, it is worth observing that it presents a snapshot of AAE genesis and

evolution and some of the important ways that AAE differs from other U.S. dialects of English. Perhaps surprising is its usefulness as a primer on African American life and history, slipping readers a valuable sketch of post–World War II African American history and U.S. race relations, with references also to prior periods.

The aforementioned observations are important because this book is, in the African American communicative tradition, unabashedly entertaining as it instructs, as it causes us to sense anew, indirectly through multiple screens and filters, the horror that white supremacist racism actually is. This horror, known by anyone who has spent seasons in poverty-infected black communities, is in one particular way especially interesting for linguistic anthropologists in that it is indexed by national discursive protocols that seek to make the horror unsayable.

The book's Foreword, by Michael Eric Dyson, and its acknowledgments ("Showin Love"), are unusually substantial. They both introduce the central, Obama-focused concerns of the book: the extent to which Obama mastered black culture even though he was not raised in a black community and how that mastery was essential, in the authors' (and my) opinion, for Obama to capture the vast majority of black voters in his electoral campaigns. "Showin Love," for example, presents two important themes, which I dwell on here because they are woven in throughout the book: (1) Obama's "racial project" to become an African American and (2) his "secondary language socialization" (xvi), for the authors another way of referencing the racial project. Having spent decades in African American communities, I see a clear basis for distinguishing the racial project from what could indeed be called secondary language socialization. I have seen Obama's racial project carried out with the same level of success by a number of young black men with parallel backgrounds but with vastly different outcomes with respect to the "African American" who emerged: same racial project, different secondary language socialization. Obama apparently saw something in the strand of African American culture that is nearly monolithic in low-income African American communities, which is magnified and caricatured in the mass media and performed to varying extents by some middle-class blacks—particularly youth. That something Obama saw was its utility in his adoption of the African American community. Other young black men in his position with similar backgrounds have adopted blacknesses more rooted in more affluent sectors of the black community, each transforming himself, not into an upper-tier professional who can hang (socialize easily) with affluent black professionals *and* residents of housing projects, but instead into such professionals who can hang with the former but generally have no desire to hang with the latter—and could not if they wanted to. So, if Obama did indeed direct his secondary language socialization, as a key part of his racial project, he dived into the bottom, socioeconomically speaking. And he dived intelligently, because any career in politics for a black person (with a few exceptions, such as former governor of Virginia, Douglas Wilder) requires being fluent in the language of the black majority.

In Chapter 1, " 'Nah, We Straight': black Language and America's First Black President," the focus is on Obama's "styleshifting," that is, shifting "between varieties of the same language" (5). Most sociolinguists would use *styleshifting* for shifting within the same variety, often along a scale of formality. However, changes in formality or other dimensions of speech might indeed in some social settings call for changes in variety (dialect in this case). Obama is able to change linguistically depending on setting, to appeal to whites, speaking a Standard English that they can feel comfortable with, while employing distinctively black prosody and discursive routines (signifying, sermonizing, and trash talking, for example) that pull blacks to him. Doing both simultaneously, i.e., speaking African American Standard English, allows him to appeal to both groups at the same time. When with a largely black audience, Obama's shifting has been known to reach into African American Vernacular English (AAVE) features such as vocabulary; and, he makes the occasional foray into AAVE morphology and syntax, notably, copula absence, as in the chapter's title (" 'Nah, We Ø Straight' ").

In Chapter 2, "A.W.B.: Articulate while Black," Alim and Smitherman look at *articulate* as applied not only to Obama and other blacks but also to members of other groups, such as Southerners, whose heritages, including language, are scorned. As the authors and other have pointed out, *articulate* implies exceptionalism, which in turn allows the user of the word to retain her or his stereotypes. It also indirectly communicates that the articulate speaker, member of some marginalized social group, has assimilated to the ever-dominant white norm, the degree of their assimilation being a measure of their acceptability. The authors propose that, with disparaging talk directly about members of disparaged groups having become unacceptable under Racism 2.0, disparagement is deflected onto a salient trait of the group such as language. *Racism 2.0* is the term coined by Tim Wise, on display in his *Between Barack and a Hard Place: Racism and White Denial in the Age of Obama* (City Lights Books, 2009).

Chapter 3 deals primarily with the incendiary (for most whites) speech of Reverend Jeremiah Wright, Obama's former pastor and father figure during his time in Chicago. The speech, containing lines such as "God damn America for treating our citizens as less than human. God damn America as long as she tries to act like she is God . . ." (70), was well within the Judeo-Christian jeremiadic tradition of U.S. preaching, whereby those who have deviated from God's path are damned, but also offered hope. That Wright's speech was in this time-honored tradition was pointed out by both Christian and Jewish religious figures; but, the storm that the repeated media attention to the speech caused forced Obama to address the furor publicly. The result was Obama's "Race Speech," during his election campaign in 2008. (The speech's actual title was "A More Perfect Union.") Of interest rhetorically is Obama's use in his speech of the African American trope "making a way out of no way," in doing so, providing yet another example of his use of African American discursive style elements in speeches before racially mixed audiences. This chapter brings out what might be the most serious reservation one might have about the book: it provides several excellent analyses up to the point where, minimally, a sketch of some type of race theory is called for, but none is provided. Obama's speech made full use of the trope that America is a work in progress: we're not where we would like to be, but certainly not where we were (chattel slavery, voting rights for propertied white males only, genocide, etc.). There is a need, at least at this juncture in the book if not before, for a discussion of racialization and racial formations generally, race and capital accumulation in the West, the institution and promotion of white supremacist racism by elites for the purpose of social control, and the roles of coercion and ideology in the maintenance of all state societies. Useful in this connection are Michael Omi and Howard Winant's *Racial Formation in the U.S.* (Routledge, 1994[1986]) and *Race and Ideology*, edited by Arthur K. Spears (Wayne State University Press, 1999).

This is by no means the first book to discuss whites' love–hate relationship with black language and culture, but it may be the first to do so with the full power of the sociolinguistic/linguistic anthropological toolkit on full display. Many black communicative behaviors have been prominent in black communities for a long time but have only recently started appearing frequently in white public space, where they are ethnocentrically subordinated to white norms. Chapter 4, "The Fist Bump Heard 'Round the World': How Black Communication Becomes Controversial," examines the crossover of words and also nonverbal behaviors such as the "fist bump" (usually called a pound by blacks) and how they are misassessed. The chapter title refers to Michelle and Barack Obama's pound, on the occasion of his election, and whites' negative reaction to it. This chapter constitutes a useful review of key concepts in black-white intercultural communication, which has recently witnessed a broad front of resistance to the status quo among blacks, who increasingly take black communicative practices with them wherever they go.

Chapter 5 details Obama's interaction with the hip-hop world, with special attention to rappers Young Jeezy's and Nas's rap "My President," from Jeezy's *Recession* album, produced in 2008, six months before Obama's victory. The prompt for the discussion of this song is the "incredible amount of race talk generated" by it (141). That race talk, however, just reflected the mostly Republican, blanket negative reaction to all things Obama. Perhaps most telling in this discussion of Obama and the hip-hop world is that Obama's more virulent critics were not culturally or linguistically and communicatively competent enough to understand and evaluate the messages conveyed by the song's lyrics.

Chapter 6, "Change the Game: Language, Education, and the Cruel Fallout of Racism," is from my perspective one of the most important in the book. It reviews the fundamentals of AAVE as it is implicated in the education of its K-12 speakers. Among the saddest tragedies for linguists is that, despite decades of trying the get the broad U.S. community, especially parents and educators, to understand that AAE is a systematic and rule-governed language variety, it has all been to no avail. Many linguists remember the 1996–97 Ebonics Controversy—and other eruptions in the 1970s and 1980s—which broke out after the Oakland Unified School District, in California, proposed to recognize that teachers' learning about Ebonics (i.e., AAVE) provides them with a critical tool for teaching Standard English to AAVE-speaking pupils. It is clear that the problem faced by AAVE speakers resulted from negative language attitudes, which are direct reflexes of the racist component of general U.S. ideology, which derogates blackness in all of its manifestations, not just language. Armed with this understanding, it is easy to appreciate the authors' recommendations to improve language education with language awareness, teaching about linguistic variation, the ethnography of communication, and the ideologies–racial, linguistic, and other—that torture so many black students' self-esteem. I would like to have seen equal attention given to a discussion of learning second dialects (e.g.,

Standard English) and second languages, using contrastive analysis and other instructional methods. This would be done in a learning environment promoting the benefits of acquiring any second language variety when the second is seen as an addition to one's already respected home variety.

A reader might be justified in stating that the authors let Obama off the hook since nothing is said about Obama's use of his impressive language competencies to manage the U.S. political economy. There are certainly discursive routines, genres, and strategies in the African American verbal repertoire that would have served Obama superbly in his campaign to institute widespread medical insurance coverage. Indeed, there are general American discursive assets that Obama could have drawn on in promoting the expansion of health insurance, to consider merely one issue. If Obama is indeed an impressive speaker, a master of black and white persuasiveness and discursive cleverness, why did he allow himself to be verbally battered and repeatedly caught flat-footed when reacting to salvos in the health care and other debates? As a companion volume to the book under review, we need an equally sterling examination of the connection between what Obama says and what he believes.

Discourses of War and Peace. *Adam Hodges*, ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. ix + 291 pp.

SAMI HERMEZ
Harvard University
Hermez@fas.harvard.edu

War is heavily reliant on discourse and is never waged "without the mediating force of discourse" (3), Hodges tells us in his opening remarks to this very compellingly argued edited volume that looks at the way war is mediated and justified through discursive practices. *Discourses of War and Peace* aims to identify, dismantle and, ultimately, expose "discourses that position war as an inevitable aspect of the human condition" (15). It is an important contribution to the study of war and can inform those who work in conflict zones, whether they focus on armed institutions (state or nonstate) or on civil society organizations. The volume can also serve as a useful teaching tool for students interested in various methodological approaches to the study of discourse as each chapter explains its approach and theoretical grounding in clear and simple language. The volume has an ambitious agenda of wanting to examine discursive practices to inform a broader discussion about "how peace might be more productively conceived" (12). While the book attempts to look at peace critically, not as the absence of war but in positive terms of its own, it falls slightly short on offering a deeper and more critical analysis of peace discourses, though this does not detract from the volume's main arguments.

The volume is divided into four parts: justifying war, negotiating military deployment responding to armed conflict, and promoting peace. Part 1, "Justifying War," comes together coherently to give the reader a clear sense of how leaders "legitimize foreign policy and military ventures" (8). In Chapter 2, Dunmire offers the most fluid account of linking discourses of war and peace. She argues that the document of the U.S. Commission for National Security in the 21st Century outlines a "peace" that divides the world into zones which paints an image of a world at war, rather than moving towards a more inclusive vision of peace (42). Hodges follows this up in Chapter 3, looking at how U.S. presidential speeches break the world into a dichotomy of Us and Them, and mobilize discourses of peace for war. Chapter 4 and 5 can be read together. Whereas the former looks at the emotions of political speeches comparing addresses by President George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden, the latter examines fact-based language of the British Weapons of Mass Destruction Dossier. In both, we see how the language of war is used as a rational step to create peace. Among the four chapters, we get a convincing and powerful account of various rhetorical strategies employed to justify war. They also familiarize us with various methods for analyzing speech and text.

The second part is "Negotiating Military Deployment." In Chapter 6, Goldie examines the difference between civilian and military discourse surrounding the aftermath of a Canadian peace enforcement mission in Somalia, and the way each discourse thinks about peacekeeping. Through this case, she introduces the concept of discursive communities that "share conventions and tacit rules of discourse" (124). The chapter offers a clear engagement with the