

they supported the legal, moral, and spiritual fight against Jim Crow favored by the NAACP. Contradictory? Not, Flamming writes, for a community caught between western openness and an ugly Jim Crow color line and far removed from the centers of black political and intellectual life back east.

Flamming follows African American Angelenos from roughly the turn of the century through the New Deal, as “the Western Ideal gradually gave way to the Liberal Ideal” (p. 322). In between, the black community fought housing covenants at every turn, turned entrepreneurial energy into new businesses, established an enduring foothold in the California legislature, and pushed as hard as possible against Jim Crow, even as black people forged lives and institutions within segregation’s limits. On the eve of the vast wartime migration of southern blacks and whites to Los Angeles, the city’s black community was stable but precariously situated in a multiracial metropolis where white supremacy was far from vanquished. As a narrative of that story, Flamming’s *Bound for Freedom* is elegant, subtle, and deep. Analytically, it is less ambitious, setting aside systematic comparisons with black community formation in other places, an examination of Southern California’s variegated color line, and a periodization that marks key points of transition more clearly. These remain minor caveats, however. *Bound for Freedom* is a work of excellent scholarship and a deft historical pen.

Brown University

ROBERT SELF

Cities of Knowledge: Cold War Science and the Search for the Next Silicon Valley. By Margaret Pugh O’Mara. (Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 2005. xiii + 298 pp. \$29.95)

This book merits attention. It avoids checking itself into a single category. Instead it informs historians, and allied social scientists, working in disparate specialties: Cold War politics, higher education, public policy, science, technology, and urbanism. *Cities of Knowledge*, originally a dissertation at the University of Pennsylvania, yields an unbounded approach to thinking historically.

Margaret Pugh O’Mara defines cities of knowledge as “engines of scientific production, filled with high-tech industries, homes for scientific workers and their families, with research universities at their heart” (p. 1). This book explores the cases of three post-1945 institutions: Stanford University (“From the Farm to the Valley”); University of Pennsylvania (“Building Brainsville”); and Georgia

Tech (“Selling the New South”). An overarching concluding question, rather unconventional for historians, is the author’s quest to comprehend which factors might culminate in further manifestations of the research-and-development industry.

Stanford University, envisioned by its founders as uniting nature with knowledge, is O’Mara’s centerpiece. The university devised its prescient role as an incubator of an adjacent research park, organized in 1951, now known as Stanford Research Park. Aside from enterprising officers and enthusiastic trustees, Stanford was abundantly rich in undeveloped land. The author proceeds to unfold narratives culminating in how the university gilded the model. The book also devotes attention to the inevitable neighborly tensions. O’Mara then proceeds to the other case studies by way of exploring counterpoints to Stanford’s successes.

Neither Penn nor Georgia Tech replicated Stanford’s achievement. In the former, it was a matter of the context of place. Whereas Stanford benefited immeasurably from its abundance of undeveloped land as well as its long-standing entrepreneurial spirit, Penn was a more circumscribed university in its outlook as well as its bounded geography. In the end, its aspiration to implement the Stanford model foundered. Especially compelling, as a point of contrast, is the fact that when neighbors objected to Stanford’s expansion, they were white, middle-class, and suburban; those objecting to Penn’s designs were urban working-class people of color. The narrative of Georgia Tech, more so than Penn, entailed regional distinctions elemental to comprehending the American nation state. O’Mara’s choice is savvy. Atlanta’s history, reaching back to the post-Civil War era, combined dual realities: entrepreneurial advancement and the unresolved realities of race. When the Stanford model manifested itself at Tech, it occurred largely in Atlanta’s northern suburbs rather than adjacent to its urban campus. Drawing upon the three case studies, O’Mara brings *Cities of Knowledge* to its conclusion with multiple lessons aimed at advising universities that dream of becoming the next Silicon Valley: the reach of a powerful university; the necessity of deep pockets; location as an imperative; and high-tech enterprise as an end unto itself, not as a panacea for resolving other agendas.

While there is much to admire in this book, it also raises questions. More attention to the very real struggle at the highest levels of government over military or civilian control of research and development is essential to support the argument for the pre-1945 period. Other neglected subjects include the need for attentiveness as to how other universities (Princeton is one case in point) figured in

O'Mara's storyline and the effects of the antiwar protests of the 1960s, involving faculty as well as students, in reshaping campus attitudes regarding the purposes of cities of knowledge. These inevitable questions also affirm that O'Mara has written a book that surely will be read and contemplated widely. *Cities of Knowledge* is destined to exert influence within as well as beyond the academy.

Lake Forest College

MICHAEL H. EBNER

Globalizing L.A.: Trade, Infrastructure, and Regional Development. By Steven P. Erie. (Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press, 2004. xii + 310 pp. \$55 cloth, \$21.95 paper)

In both popular culture and academic scholarship, water and cars are portrayed as keys to the emergence of Los Angeles as a major global city. In *Globalizing L.A.: Trade, Infrastructure, and Regional Development*, Steven P. Erie makes a compelling case that such accounts ignore civic leaders' conscious and successful efforts to stimulate trade and growth via public investments in the city's port and airport.

The central role of Los Angeles as a leader of popular culture makes it easy to overlook the fact that "once a trade backwater, Southern California has emerged as one of the world's leading centers for trade and development." Illustratively, "between 1972 and 2000, Los Angeles' share of the nation's global merchandise trade climbed from 6 to 14 percent, while New York's share dropped from 21 to 12 percent" (p. 9).

This growth was not preordained. Indeed, at the turn of the last century, the city was landlocked, while its economic competitors—notably San Diego and San Francisco—both had good natural harbors. Similarly, in the 1930s, when aviation was taking root, Los Angeles was at a modest competitive disadvantage because, unlike other cities, which had publicly owned airfields, it leased its airport.

Using a variety of archival materials, public documents, and (for later developments) interviews, Erie provides rich accounts of how the city's civic leaders overcame these obstacles. In the early twentieth century, they orchestrated the annexation of the port cities of San Pedro and Wilmington, and for much of the twentieth century officials in Los Angeles and Long Beach (which operates a separate port in the same harbor) expanded their ports and responded to the emergence of container ships and the shift of manufacturing activity to Asia. As a result, each port now handles more