



PROJECT MUSE®

---

*Dark Side of the Moon: The Magnificent Madness of the  
American Lunar Quest* (review)

Kim McQuaid

American Studies, Volume 48, Number 1, Spring 2007, pp. 169-170 (Review)

Published by Mid-American Studies Association

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/ams.0.0027>



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/375283>

as a fellow Jew. Yet it was among Columbia's liberal Jewish intellectuals that this son of an immigrant intermarriage between an Eastern European Jewish furrier and a German Lutheran mother found a home. Hofstadter was invited into what Daniel Bell called "the West Side Kibbutz," a group that included Bell, Seymour Martin Lipset, Lionel Trilling, Fritz Stern, Peter Gay, and Walter Metzger. Hofstadter's debt to Morningside Heights was molded by these friends and colleagues.

A sharp critic of capitalism and deeply suspicious of rightwing anti-Communists, Hofstadter also mistrusted "the people" as too easily manipulated. The university became his refuge, where he believed the free exchange of ideas remained crucial to democracy. Beleaguered and confused by the student rebellions of the 1960s, he reserved his sharpest criticism for white students, whose self-indulgent bating of the police he felt threatened academic freedom.

What is missing from Brown's treatment of this period and from much of the biography, however, is an analysis of Hofstadter's views on race. Brown notes his sympathy for black sharecroppers in his master's thesis, his support for the civil rights movement, and his willingness to defend the rights of certain prominent individuals—Angela Davis and Eldridge Cleaver, for example—who were threatened by the security state. But he barely mentions that Columbia students protested not only the Vietnam War, but the university's plan for a new gymnasium in an African-American neighborhood, displacing black residents and denying them access to the new facility. These students believed the university to be a microcosm of U.S. inequalities. Nor does Brown discuss the debate over racial preferences in the mid-1960s between black intellectuals and liberal, primarily Jewish academics. Here Brown's methodology, which utilizes Hofstadter's published writings to frame his narrative, does not serve him well. In 1964, Columbia graduate Norman Podhoretz, freshly installed editor of *Commentary Magazine*, launched a roundtable on "Liberalism and the Negro" which, in retrospect, laid bare pluralism's inadequacies, especially with regard to how race worked to block social mobility for African Americans. Several members of the "Upper West Side Kibbutz" eventually joined in a heated conversation with black intellectuals, including James Baldwin and City University psychologist Kenneth B. Clark, which continued into the 1970s. Jewish social scientists including Nathan Glazer, Bell, Lipset, and others brandished immigrant Jewish success as proof of pluralism and opportunity in U.S. society, even for oppressed minorities. They considered African Americans as any other ethnic group, eventually faulting, not the larger society, but the inadequacies of black community institutions. There are hints in Brown's analysis of Hofstadter's last published work, *America at 1750*, that he took his cues on the emerging racial crisis from his pluralist colleagues in the Upper West Side Kibbutz, but what else did he think about these divisive issues?

Despite these omissions, Brown has captured Hofstadter's intellectual complexity, his brilliance as a writer, thinker, mentor, colleague, and friend, with considerable skill and sensitivity.

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Regina Morantz-Sanchez

**DARK SIDE OF THE MOON: The Magnificent Madness of the American Lunar Quest.**  
By Gerard DeGroot. New York: New York University Press. 2006.

Gerard A. DeGroot's survey summarizes other volumes about the first 25 years of the U.S. human spaceflight program. On top of works by William E. Burrows, Paul Dickson, Howard McCurdy, Walter McDougall, Tom Wolfe, and others, DeGroot then stacks an upper stage of unconventional analysis. Though not included in his bibliography or notes,

readers of William Sims Bainbridge's *The Spaceflight Revolution* of 1976 will find much of DeGroot's argument familiar. The Apollo program was a "brilliant deception" and "glorious swindle," created by "a gang of cynics, manipulators, demagogues, tyrants, and even a few criminals" (xi, xiv). "Scheming politicians," "tricksters" (i.e., Wernher von Braun), and profit hungry aerospace managers cooperated with a "weapons industry" that was "an octopus whose tentacles held politicians, academics, and financiers in a steely grip" and created a "meaningless contest" that "fleeced" citizens for an "ego trip to the Moon" (xii, 87, 98).

Obviously, conspiracy is at the center of DeGroot's argument. This is a corrective to standard technoutopian triumphalisms. The author, however, too often tries to substitute literary flourishes for sustained research. The military-industrial complex point above, for instance, is affirmed, not discussed. Corruption in aerospace contracting, meanwhile, merits half a page; DeGroot then concludes "And you thought Apollo was a story about heroes" (153). Rhetorical?, yes; persuasive?, no.

The same characterizes the discussion of popular attitudes. For the first 9 chapters, "public opinion" is a monolith reflected (or, more often, created) by journalists. "A hysterical public, egged on by an ignorant and irresponsible media, engaged in an orgy of fear" after Sputnik (62). Rhetorical orgies aside, DeGroot does not mention polls or how "fickle" or "hard to measure" opinion actually was until page 188.

DeGroot's critiques are also familiar. (Monolithic) "science" was sacrificed on the altar of politics and prestige. Earth-focused weather, communication, navigation, and spy satellites had far more important and enduring effects than astronauts. The first point is simplistic. Space scientists in new specialties (i.e. geologists who became "comparative planetologists") "raced" to get robotic spacecraft to Mars, Venus, and beyond before the Russians, and spent billions doing it. The latter point is very true (but, again, left undeveloped).

DeGroot too regularly over-reaches in his arguments. Saying that "for most Americans, the [thermonuclear weapons] 'missile gap' and the [Cold War prestige-based] space race were two sides of the same coin" is a big, bold generalization (92). It also needs substantiation the author does not provide. Saying that space was an "all-consuming [cultural] distraction" and that "America was lost in space" in the 1960s equates young white males in high school and college with technical interests with everybody of every race, age and gender (183). Accuracy takes second place to simplicity. Sixteen pages later, DeGroot admits "enthusiasm for NASA was a manifestation of socioeconomic standing" (199).

DeGroot's book will puzzle or infuriate space advocates. Accordingly, it will also be a good text to use in advanced courses and graduate programs. At its best, it strikes right to central points. At its worst, it is overblown phrasing masquerading as analysis. Used carefully, DeGroot's book helps clarify how transcendent, prestige-based, space projects can get lavish funding for very short periods; while pragmatic programs providing clear and immediate Earthly benefits enjoy enduring popularity.

Lake Erie College

Kim McQuaid

ELECTRIC LADYLAND: Women and Rock Culture. By Lisa L. Rhodes. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 2005.

The word "groupie" is commonplace, a derisive term used to describe a particular kind of female fan assumed to be more interested in sex with rock stars than in their music. Groupies are understood to be "easy," with low self-esteem, and too stupid about